Edna H. Purcell, Waterloo, N. Y., in place of J. F. Marshall, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mandrup C. Olufson, Enderlin, N. Dak., in place of J. G. Martin, transferred.

OHIO

John L. Bricker, Mount Sterling, Ohio, in place of Palmer Phillips, removed.

OKLAHOMA

Walter D. Barrett, Collinsville, Okla., in place of O. V. Stevens, retired.

Martin R. Jackson, Henryetta, Okla., in place of W. E. Ingram, resigned.

Myron M. Gastineau, Taloga, Okla., in place of J. L. Foster, deceased.

OREGON

Myrl A. Haygood, Philomath, Oreg., in place of M. R. Brown, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lydia S. Love, Cheyney, Pa., in place of G. V. Proctor, removed.

John W. Beach, Fairfield, Pa., in place of G. M. Neely, retired.

John W. Reznor, Greenville, Pa., in place of F. W. Moser, retired.

Leonard Wayne Elder, Rochester Mills, Pa., in place of R. M. Henry, resigned.

Edward R. Kulick, Shamokin, Pa., in place of J. E. Staniszewski, retired.

C. Lyman Sturgis, Uniontown, Pa., in place of J. A. Reilly, removed.

Esther S. Neeld, Wrightstown, Pa., in place of J. E. Hilborn, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Raphael L. Morris, Clemson, S. C., in place of C. R. Goodman, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Casimir F. Kot, Stephan, S. Dak., in place of K. H. Holtzman, declined.

TENNESSEE

Josephine H. Vandergriff, Briceville, Tenn., in place of Lutie Davis, retired.

Len K. Mahler, Cookeville, Tenn., in place of F. P. Moore, retired.

Laverne M. Tabor, Crossville, Tenn., in place of H. E. Davenport, resigned.

LeRoy M. Cook, Gallatin, Tenn., in place of O. V. Smith, retired.

Charlene M. Reece, Jonesboro, Tenn., in place of E. R. McAmis, transferred.

VERMONT

Morris W. Depew, Dorset, Vt., in place of S. M. Matson, deceased.

VIRGINIA

William L. Pickhardt, Chester, Va., in place of M. H. Truby, deceased.

Beulah W. Davis, Concord, Va., in place of J. M. Cross, retired.

Marion L. Beeton, Lexington, Va., in place of F. C. Davis, retired.

Virginia C. Foskett, Lynnhaven, Va., in place of M. V. Mills, retired.

Richard F. Weaver, New Market, Va., in place of E. M. Bennick, removed.

Ralph T. Phillips, Parksley, Va., in place of H. T. Scarborough, retired.

Flora M. Branham, Pound, Va., in place of G. L. Robinson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lee F. Hornor, Bridgeport, W. Va., in place of M. K. Brown, resigned.

John L. McMahon, Follansbee, W. Va., in place of J. J. Walker, retired.

Sabinus M. McWhorter, Weston, W. Va., in place of L. S. Switzer, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clifford J. McKenzie, Centuria, Wis., in place of M. C. Hoey, transferred.

Virginia F. Waupochick, Keshena, Wis., in place of B. E. James, removed.

Amy J. Pofahl, Pleasant Prairie, Wis., in place of L. A. Pofahl, deceased.

Estelle W. Hill, Sarona, Wis., in place of H. A. Stromberg, transferred.

Herbert N. Hoskins, Shell Lake, Wis., in place of J. S. Kennedy, deceased.

Wallace L. Nelson, Siren, Wis., in place of J. S. Dodson, retired.

WYOMING

Evalee V. Arnwine, Linch, Wyo. Office established December 1, 1951.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 14 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter E. Hoffman to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia. (New position.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William A. O'Brien to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 14 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Sara K. Lee, postmaster at Flat Rock, Ala.

ARKANSAS

Mrs. Jessie C. Brewer, postmaster at Higginson, Ark.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Joseph L. Teletchea, St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, who at this critical moment of the world's history hast chosen to place such great burdens upon the minds and hearts of our Representatives, go before them, we beseech Thee, in all their doings with Thy gracious inspiration, and further them with Thy continual help, that their every prayer and work may begin from Thee, and by Thee be duly ended.

Let not ignorance draw them into devious paths, nor partiality sway their minds. Neither let respect of riches or persons pervert their judgment; but unite them to Thee effectually by the gift of Thine only grace, that they may be one in Thee and may never forsake the truth; that so in this life their judgment may in nowise be at variance with Thee; and in the life to come they may attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5173. An act to provide that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over unemployment compensation administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a $200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account which will be available for advances to the States, to provide that the remainder of such excess shall be returned to the States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1303. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan; and

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Senate on continuing the operation of a tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and to investigate the need of a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry and the adequacy of our strategic stockpile of tin.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4854) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the irrigation works comprising the Foster Creek division of the Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CORDON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. JACKSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2900) entitled "An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Harding Lake Camp, Inc., of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use as a youth camp and related purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CORDON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. LONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 hours tomorrow, after the business of the House is completed and following any special orders heretofore entered into, and that I may address the House for an hour today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that any speeches over an hour in length must have the approval of all Members of the House.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that she may speak for 3 hours tomorrow afternoon. Is there objection?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Is there any other request the gentlewoman wishes to submit?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak for 2 hours tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 1 hour this afternoon, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SANTA MARGARITA RIVER PROJECT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5731) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2111)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5731) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, California, and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, as far as those laws are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain such dam and other facilities as may be required to make available for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses the yield of the reservoir created by De Luz Dam to be located immediately below the confluence of De Luz Creek with Santa Margarita River on Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, San Diego, California, for the Fallbrook Public Utility District and such other users as herein provided. The authority of the Secretary to construct said facilities is contingent upon a determination by him that—

"(a) the Fallbrook Public Utility District shall have entered into a contract under subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 undertaking to repay to the United States of America appropriate portions, as determined by the Secretary of the actual costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining such dam and other facilities, together with interest as hereinafter provided; and under no circumstances shall the Department of the Navy be subject to any charges or costs except on the basis of its proportional use, if any, of such dam and other facilities, as determined pursuant to section 2 (b) of this Act;

'(b) the officer or agency of the State of California authorized by law to grant permits for the appropriation of water shall have granted such permits to the United States of America and shall have granted permits to the Fallbrook Public Utility District for rights to the use of water for storage and diversion as provided in this Act; including, as to the Fallbrook Public Utility District, approval of all requisite changes in points of diversion and storage, and purposes and places of use;

"(c) The Fallbrook Public Utility District shall have agreed that it will not assert against the United States of America any prior appropriative right it may have to water in excess of that quantity deliverable to it under the provisions of this Act, and will share in the use of the waters impounded by the De Luz Dam on the basis of equal priority and in accordance with the ratio prescribed in section 3 (a) of this Act; this agreement and waiver and the changes in points of diversion and storage, required by the preceding paragraph, shall become effective and binding only when the dam and other facilities herein provided for shall have been completed and put into operation: *Provided, however,* That the enactment of this legislation does not constitute a recognition of, or an admission that, the Fallbrook Public Utility District has any rights to the use of water in the Santa Margarita River, which rights, if any, exist only by virtue of the laws of the State of California; and

"(d) The De Luz Dam and other facilities herein authorized have economic and engineering feasibility.

"SEC. 2. (a) In the interest of comity between the United States of America and the State of California and consistent with the historic policy of the United States of America of Federal noninterference with State water law, the Secretary of the Navy shall promptly comply with the procedures for the acquisition of appropriative water rights required under the laws of the State of California as soon as he is satisfied, with the advice of the Attorney General of the United States, that such action will not adversely affect the rights of the United States of America under the laws of the State of California.

"(b) The Department of the Navy will not be subject to any charges or costs in connection with the De Luz Dam or its facilities, except upon completion and then shall be charged in reasonable proportion to its use of the facilities under regulations agreed upon by the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. (a) The operation of the dam and other facilities herein provided shall be by the Secretary of the Interior, under regulations satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the Navy's share of the impounded water and National Security. In that operation, 60 per centum of the water impounded by De Luz Dam is hereby allotted to the Secretary of the Navy, 40 per centum of the water impounded by De Luz Dam is hereby allotted to the Fallbrook Public Utility District. The Department of the Navy and the Fallbrook Public Utility District will participate in the water impounded by De Luz Dam on the basis of equal priority and in accordance with the ratio prescribed in the preceding sentence: *Provided, however,* That at any time the Secretary of the Navy certifies that he does not have immediate need for any portion of the aforesaid 60 per centum of the water, the official agreed upon to administer the dam and facilities is empowered to enter into temporary contracts for the delivery of water subject, however, to the first right of the Secretary of the Navy to demand that water without charge and without obligation on the part of the United States of America upon 30 days' notice as set forth in any such contract with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further,* That all moneys paid in to the United States of America under any such contract shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, and shall not be applied against the indebtedness of the Fallbrook Public Utility District to the United States of America. In making any such temporary contracts for water not immediately needed by the Navy, the first right thereto, if otherwise consistent with the laws of the State of California, shall be given the Fallbrook Public Utility District.

"(b) The general repayment obligation of the Fallbrook Public Utility District (which shall include interest on the unamortized balance of construction costs of the project allocated to municipal and domestic waters at a rate equal to the average rate, which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury, on the long-term loans of the United States outstanding on the date of this Act) to be undertaken pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be spread in annual installments, which need not be equal, over a period of not more than 56 years, exclusive of a development period, or as near thereto as is consistent with the operation of a formula, mutually agreeable to the parties, under which the payments are varied in the light of factors pertinent to the irrigators' ability to pay. The development period shall begin in the year in which water for use by the district is first available, as announced by the Secretary, and shall end in the year in which the conservation storage space in De Luz Reservoir first fills but shall, in no event, exceed 17 years. During the development period water shall be delivered to the district under annual water rental notices at rates fixed by the Secretary and payable in advance, and any moneys collected in excess of operation and maintenance costs shall be credited to repayment of the capital costs chargeable to the district and the repayment period fixed herein shall be reduced proportionately. The Secretary may transfer to the district the care, operation, and maintenance of the facilities constructed by him under conditions satisfactory to him and to the district and, with respect to such of the facilities as are located within the boundaries of Camp Pendleton, satisfactory also to the Secretary of the Navy.

"(c) For the purposes of this Act the basis, measure, and limit of all rights of the United States of America pertaining to the use of water shall be the laws of the State of California: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as a grant or a relinquishment by the United States of America of any of its rights to the use of water which it acquired according to the laws of the State of California either as a result of its acquisition of the lands comprising Camp Joseph H. Pendleton and adjoining naval installations, and the rights to the use of water as a part of said acquisition, or through actual use or prescription or both since the date of that acquisition, if any, or to create any legal obligation to store any water in De Luz Reservoir, to the use of which it has such rights, or to require the division under this Act of water to which it has such rights.

"(d) Unless otherwise agreed by the Secretary of the Navy, De Luz Dam as herein provided shall at all times be operated in a manner which will permit the free passage of all of the water to the use of which the United States of America is entitled according to the laws of the State of California either as a result of its acquisition of the lands comprising Camp Joseph H. Pendleton and adjoining naval installations, and the rights to the use of water as a part of said acquisitions, or through actual use or prescription or both since the date of that acquisition, if any, and will not be administered or operated in any way which will impair or deplete the quantities of water to the use of which the United States of America would be entitled under the laws of the State of California had that structure not been built.

"SEC. 4. After the construction of the De Luz Dam, the official operating the reservoir shall deliver water to the Fallbrook Public Utility District, pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior, as follows:

"(1) One thousand eight hundred acre-feet in any year until the reservoir attains an active content of sixty-three thousand acre-feet;

"(2) Not in excess of four thousand eight hundred acre-feet in any year after the reservoir attains an active content of sixty-three thousand acre-feet and until said reservoir attains an active content of ninety-eight thousand acre-feet; and

"(3) Not in excess of eight thousand acre-feet in any year after the reservoir attains an active content of ninety-eight thousand acre-feet and until the conservation storage space of the reservoir has been filled.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Army through the Chief of Engineers, acting in accordance with section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) is authorized to utilize for purposes of flood control such portion of the capacity of De Luz Reservoir as may be available therefor.

"SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $22,636,000, the current estimated construction cost of the Santa Margarita River project, plus or minus such amounts as may be indicated by the engineering cost indices for this type of construction, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the said project.

"SEC. 7. From time to time the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Congress concerning the conditions specified in section 1 of this Act, and the first report thereon shall be submitted to the Congress no later than one year from the date of enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses from the Santa Margarita River, California, and for other purposes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

A. L. MILLER,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5731) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: The House accepts the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 2: The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agrees to the same with an amendment as heretofore set forth.

The managers for the House expressed concern at conferences on this bill lest the language of section 2 (a), coupled with the requirement set forth in section 1 (b), that prior to construction the State of California shall have granted a permit to the United States for rights to the use of water for storage and diversion as provided in the bill, would serve as a roadblock to proceeding with construction of the project. As a result of this concern, a letter was sent to the Attorney General asking what doubts the Justice Department might have concerning possible adverse effect on riparian rights, under California law, from action taken to obtain permits for the appropriation of flood flows which would be stored by the De Luz Dam. By letter dated June 22, 1954, the Attorney General furnished the conferees a 17-page memorandum on the matter, the conclusion of which follows:

"Loss to the United States of America of invaluable presently existing, long-exercised, riparian rights to the use of water in the Santa Margarita River will ensue if the requisite steps are taken to prosecute to completion appropriative rights in that stream to meet demands for water at Camp Pendleton, the United States Naval Hospital, and the United States Naval Ammunition Depot."

The managers for the House have carefully studied this memorandum and they wish to make it clear that they are not convinced by this memorandum that the riparian rights of the United States could be prejudiced under California law by prosecution to completion of appropriative rights to flood waters. With this understanding of their position and upon pointing out that the memorandum bears out their original concern with respect to the language in section 2 (a), the managers for the House agreed not to press further for changes in the language in section 2 (a) as it became evident that such action could only end in permanent disagreement.

The House agrees to the title change made by the Senate.

A. L. MILLER,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES I. SMITH

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1673) for the relief of James I. Smith, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "act." and insert "act".
Line 9, strike out "have" and insert "has."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HATSUKO KUNIYOSHI DILLON

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5578) for the relief of Hatsuko Kuniyoshi Dillon with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "act." over to and including line 3 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOES THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION BLOCK MEDICAL ADVANCEMENT?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for insertion at this point in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, are the remarks of a brave and fearless man; grievously wounded in World War II, Mr. Joseph F. Burke returned to America from the battlefields of Europe determined to brighten the plight of the wounded.

Here is his story as told the other day, on July 9, 1954, to the Astoria chapter, of the Disabled American Veterans in Long Island City, N. Y. Mr. Burke, a constituent, is 2d national junior vice commander of the DAV.

The core of Mr. Burke's remarks would suggest that the American Medical Association do its best to keep its muzzle on when it passes through soldier terrain, lest it bite the hand—Uncle Sam's—that has helped it so often; and, as the AMA moves, to be very careful, lest it knock over signs which read "men at work," especially when the work is directed at brightening the

plight of the wounded, now and for the future:

AMA: AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OR AGAINST MEDICAL ADVANCEMENT

(Remarks by Joseph F. Burke, second national junior vice commander, Disabled American Veterans)

There are times when a man stands on a public platform and feels the need to speak out against an organization. His evaluation of that organization is necessarily tempered because of the realization that the people who make up the membership are not at fault. I am in that situation now as regards the American Medical Association. The American people, or all peoples of the world, for that matter, are indebted to those who follow the Hippocratic oath. Your speaker is certainly one of those. On January 2, 1944, I was wounded on the approaches to Cassino, Italy, while serving my country in time of war. The repair of the left arm wound by amputation was one of the easier operative procedures performed by these masters of the medical profession. With both arms and legs damaged to the extent of smashed bones, torn muscles, and severed nerves, and internal wounds showing a number of punctures of the stomach, liver, lungs, and spleen, it is a marvel to me today that the surgical team of Major Brinker and Captain Moore was able to repair such bodily damage in six exhaustive and intensive hours of surgery. It was their skill and God's will that permits me to address you tonight. I say this not because I am unique, as there are many in this room who know that this is a typical case history of thousands of former GI's. The debt of gratitude I owe these men I will never be able to repay.

And because of my strong feeling against the policies of the American Medical Association, the remarks I make tonight reflect only my own personal opinion, and is not to be construed as being the feeling of the national organization of the Disabled American Veterans.

Yet, as a veteran I must speak out against the American Medical Association, who professes to represent the thoughts of the entire medical profession. Their expressions of disagreement with the Veterans' Administration hospital program has been injurious to the entire veteran population. The American people, through its elected representatives, has brought for the finest medical program for veterans, only to suffer attacks on their efforts to care for the wars' disabled. As a result, we face a serious curtailment of the Disabled American Veterans' program for veterans. We find that by advocating the return of mental and tubercular patients to city, county, and State institutions under the guise of a reduced tax program, the AMA reveals an immature outlook, since there will be no savings, because these local governments will be charged with too big a burden and the veterans will then receive less than the best of care as intended by our laws. We demand an opportunity to monitor the care to be given our mental and tubercular patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals instead of in city, county, and State institutions which at best would be inefficiently administered, and without any control by the Federal Government. Again, where would the savings be in taxes? It would cost just as much for the maintenance and care of these veterans in these lower institutions because they are overcrowded now. This influx of a veteran population would make conditions chaotic, with the resultant loss of medical efficiency and proper care to the patient, both veteran and nonveteran.

The Disabled American Veterans will continue to fight any approach of this sort under the guise of tax reduction. We believe that the American people will willingly accept the care of the war disabled and the necessary hospitalization and care of the indigent war veterans as a part of the cost of war. Congress recognized this responsibility and provided for it by laws.

It is true in the technical sense that the majority of our hospitalized veterans are admitted for disabilities labeled nonservice connected. However, honest medical opinion will admit that a probable relationship of the postservice disease or debility exists with the veteran's service. So, with this aforementioned probable relationship who can say that those who experienced the anxiety attached with the hazards of war have not incurred that basic lowered threshold of fatigue and susceptibility which invites illness. Since medical opinion may be altered with the new policy of the AMA this theory may not stand a professional argument today.

One of the strong points made by the AMA against the hospitalization of veterans was that their investigation disclosed that a veteran earning $50,000 a year was found hospitalized for a nonservice connected condition. Now I ask you, how many veterans today are making $50,000 a year? The argument is unfounded on the surface, and in addition, it was later discovered that the veteran had been, in fact, treated for a service connected condition. A second point made by the AMA against hospitalization was that the Veterans' Administration hospitals harbor an army of alcoholics. Now all of us in this room know the strict rules by which the Veterans' Administration hospitals operate. It is an established fact that a veteran will receive an immediate disciplinary discharge and not be eligible for readmission for 90 days if he displays drunkenness on the ward. This charge simply cannot be true because the regulations do not permit prolonged hospitalization for such a condition. In passing, please let me call your attention to the often expressed opinion of the medical profession that alcoholism is a disease; very often the manifestation of a mental disorder. Does the AMA now say that a disease should not be treated?

The AMA arguments against nonservice-connected cases appears to revolve around the issue of ability to pay. Certainly we realize that group hospitalization or insurance plans are available. However, being mainly group policies, they are available to only those whose employment status serves as a prerequisite. The employer or union can insure that the group plans are the best available for the employees and union members. Yet this takes care of only a certain segment of the population. There are private plans available to anyone outside of a company or union, but these are usually so honeycombed with so many clarifying and delimiting clauses that the average policy is not sufficient to meet an individual's need. Ability to pay is a misnomer in many cases even with the above plans which have limitations. The average cost for an operation and hospitalization at prevailing rates, room and board, nursing care, averages $12 a day. Medicines, treatments, X-rays, and doctor's visits are all extra. A reasonable figure for 1 month's hospitalization under these conditions would amount to $870 a month. The average head of a family earns $3,500 per year. Where is the ability to pay?

The AMA makes the claim that veteran's hospitalization programs are nothing but socialized medicine. Today we face these continuous increasing cries from one agency or another, "the road to socialism." Crying socialism is no argument since it is an established policy in politics today to label your opponent with an unpopular title. Bipartisan legislation over the years in our State and Nation have caused such things to come into being; social security, Federal old-age benefits, employment compensation, compulsory disability insurance, and Federal aid to education. Is the AMA opposed to these advances and progresses? Then why do they feel that taking care of or insuring the proper health of the veteran segment of the population is another step toward socialism?

Let us look at how the AMA people have benefited under the Government aid. Under the GI bill, how many doctors have increased their knowledge in their chosen field? How many ex-GI's have become doctors under the GI bill? Millions of dollars which have been advanced in this country for medical research has helped the advance of medicine. Was this socialism? The generosity of the American people, through charitable drives, contributed a great deal of money to medical research on cancer, tuberculosis, heart disease, crippled children's research, and muscular dystrophies. Would the AMA prefer that these necessary monies be obtained through taxation rather than this support of medicine by the people? Let me give you the benefit of my own experience with the shortsightedness of the AMA.

In World War II, I was one of 50,000 amputees and like everyone of them, my amputation healed and I found myself ready for an artificial arm. I found that since the Civil War, no improvements had been made in the prosthetics devices field. Now mind you, the doctor's job is not finished with the sewing of a stump; he is also responsible for the fitting of the amputee with a suitable limb and insure the ability to obtain some use of the artificial limb. Imagine our dismay when we found that the artificial hand was not expected to perform any function other than to serve as a cosmetic device; to appear two-handed. A heavy cumbersome thing which served better hanging in the closet. The useful device was a heavy hook which was still operated by rubber bands and a heavy cable which proceeded to tear the sleeves out of our clothing. I know the leg amputee had only about three times as many heartaches trying to walk in the crude limbs which served no better than the old fashioned peg. This was certainly disheartening to the new born amputee. However, near the end of World War II, the plight of the amputee became evident and a newspaperman, a retired officer who was himself an amputee, and a few other interested people from all walks of life convinced the Government to form a committee on prosthetic research.

This committee was formed by and of members unrelated with the AMA, who failed to encourage the project and refused it help. With the support of Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, the Army and the Navy, the limb manufacturers, this research began. The difficulties were tremendous and each year was a greater struggle for necessary funds from the Congress for its operation. At no time did the AMA offer its help, and it would have been greatly welcomed, and would have been an invaluable aid; yet, what are the committee's results? Its research programs at the Army Prosthetic Research Laboratory, Northrop Aviation Corp., New York University, the University of Southen California, and the International Business Machines produced artificial aids to greet the amputee of the Korean conflict and all amputees which were far superior to any available to World War II at the close of the war. This work is still going on today, and as yet the AMA as an organization has not contributed one iota toward the program.

I charge that the AMA no longer stands for American Medical Association, but it means to me "against medical advancement." In the halls of Congress as of this moment, facts against the AMA are being brought out. We know that isolationism as regards to people means that the concern of these people is for the United States itself. But even those people who believe in such a "go it

alone" theory, would not go along with the AMA theory of isolationism in medicine. Medical research in other countries beside our own has brought forth many new and constructive theories as regards, for instance, cancer. The AMA is now fighting the introduction into this country of such proven research. I point out to you in passing that Sir Alexander Fleming, an Englishman, was not an American but contributed greatly in the advance with penicillin which has benefited mankind. Sister Kenny, an Australian, whose treatment of polio although proven beneficial time and time again has yet to receive AMA approval. This hierarchy which speaks for the medical profession in the United States with its dangerous control of medical thinking has done more to retard medical advancement than any uneducated or illiterate segment of our population in their refusal to accept medical treatment over the years. We as veterans and especially in our consideration of disabled veterans, which is the only reason for the DAV to be in existence, that is our creed, that "our mission as a Disabled American Veterans organization is not fulfilled until all our country's wartime disabled, their widows, and their dependents, have been adequately cared for," recognize as one of our greatest adversaries those who speak for the AMA. The crucifix of the AMA's making bears not the figure of Christ, but the war's mangled veteran. Since the days of George Washington, it was recognized that the war's disabled became more susceptible to the ravages of disease. We feel that the Veterans' Administration program of care for the hospitalized veteran at times can be improved. On the basis of results today, we know that it is the finest medical program in the country. We have more than 6,300 doctors, 865 dentists, and 13,800 trained nurses. This program of care for the veteran is without parallel in any other nation in the world. The debt of honor has been assumed by the American people with little or no complaint. The veteran himself is a taxpayer and yet the AMA for reasons best known to itself continues to fight the well regulated program of the United States Government. It fights the administration of President Eisenhower on the health program which he has offered to the Nation. I charge the AMA as being against medical advancement because of their own self-centered interests and of dictating to this Nation what the policies of health and welfare should be from their conception and their conception alone. The DAV will continue to fight the AMA on the issues of disabled veterans, and I hope all the people of this Nation will fight those few who speak for the AMA, who resist the health and research programs necessary for the well-being of our country.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday, next following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO RECOGNIZE MEMBERS ON MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order on Wednesday, July 21, for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RULES FOR PROCEDURE ON REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF UNITED STATES TAX COURT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1067) to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code be amended by adding at the end thereof a new section, as follows:

"'§ 2074. Rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States

"'The Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe, and from time to time amend, uniform rules for the filing of petitions of notices of appeal, the preparation of records, and the practice, forms, and procedure in the several United States Courts of Appeals in proceedings for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

"'Such rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant.

"'Such rules shall not take effect until they shall have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the 1st day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported.'

"SEC. 2. The chapter analysis of chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code immediately preceding section 2071 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'2074. Rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file any rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 630, Rept. No. 2214), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 439, Rept. No. 2215), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1955, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

2. The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1954 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, chapter 120, 1st session, referred to as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States, or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1954, and the campaigns of candi-

dates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

7. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

8. The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

9. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1955, as hereinabove provided.

AMENDING TITLE II OF THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution (H. Res. 624) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3539) to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 624 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (S. 3539) to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services.

House Resolution 624 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to revise upward the scale for computing reenlistment bonuses paid under the Career Compensation Act. Under the proposed legislation, payments will be based upon the number of years for which a person reenlists, computed upon the grade in which an enlisted member is serving at the time his enlistment expires preceding his reenlistment.

First reenlistment bonuses would be greater than for the second and become progressively less for the third and fourth reenlistments. The reason for this is that the number of men reenlisting at the end of the first enlistment period is much smaller than after the second, third, and fourth. It is therefore important that the incentive for enlistment be highest at the end of the first enlistment period.

Mr. Speaker, according to the report on this bill, the maximum amount of reenlistment bonuses to which an individual would be entitled to under this bill would be $2,000. S. 3539 would raise the amount of bonuses to $560 more than is allowed under the present limitation.

The bill would also provide that no reenlistment bonuses would accrue after the completion of 20 years of service, notwithstanding the maximum bonus allowance.

Mr. Speaker, the bill attempts to revise the reenlistment bonus scale so that the individual who has advanced up in the services through promotion would receive a larger bonus for reenlistment than the individual who has not progressed in rank over the years.

This bill should receive the attention of the House membership for the simple reason that it is vital that the United States maintain a strong military force.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule will be adopted by the House without delay and that we may proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the consideration of this rule or to the bill which it makes in order. I know of no objection to the bill.

My purpose in taking this time is to say to the chairman of the committee that I think the minority is at least entitled to the courtesy of being informed as to what rules are to be called up so that we may know just what to expect and what is going to be done.

I did not know this rule was to be called up. Neither the rule nor the bill were available at the desk; we had to send for them and just succeeded in getting them.

I had been informed that another bill was to be called up.

I think I am easy to get along with and I am not going to complain unduly, but I take this moment to say that I shall insist from now on that we be given ample notice of what rules are going to be called up in the morning. I do not want to consume the time of the House by quorum calls but I shall certainly be forced to do that in order to keep ourselves on this side informed as to what is the program for the day.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. As was included in the whip notice put out at the beginning of the week certain bills were listed, including this one, should rules be granted. When I received notice that the Committee on Rules had kindly granted a rule I discussed it with the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and he agreed that it would be all right to call it up. So we thought there was no misunderstanding whatsoever and that the bill could be considered at this particular time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am quite modest about these things and I do not want to inject myself into things needlessly, but I do hope the leadership on the other side, and especially my chairman, will remember the fact that we have a minority on the Rules Committee, and that the rule is called up before the bill is called up.

I happen to be the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and would like the courtesy of being advised as to what is going to be called up mornings by way of rules.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am sorry about this. Frankly, I did not know what was coming up myself.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope that in the future the leadership on the majority side will inform the chairman of the Committee on Rules what it is expected to bring up on the floor the following day.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly the gentleman does not undertake by reason of this particular circumstance today to mean that we have not been very, very diligent in informing the minority as to what

was coming up. We try to get out as complete a whip notice as possible, but sometimes we are not able to be definite and cannot always put on the whip notice a precise time the bill will be called. Certainly that is something to be desired and I am sorry that the gentleman is discomforted by this particular operation. Possibly the Rules Committee should have been notified along with members of the legislative committee. However, the gentleman voted for the rule on yesterday or at least was present when a vote was taken and he might have been informed that these measures would be coming along for consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not want to prolong this discussion. I just want to say that I think we are entitled to the courtesy of knowing what rules are going to be called up each morning before we are called upon to speak. We ought to know and have time, preferably the day before.

While I am on my feet I might mention what happened yesterday. Usually we have 10, 15, or 20 minutes in the morning before a rule is called up. I did not know that a rule was going to be immediately called up. I walked in here at 5 minutes past 12 yesterday. My chairman had called up a rule, it had been read and discussed in 5 minutes, at which time he was about to move the previous question on the rule. It is a very simple thing to give us a telephone call and say that today we are going to call up a certain rule. I hope that will be done in the future. While I am on my feet, may I inquire what is the program today?

Mr. ARENDS. I was about to inform the gentleman. After we complete this bill we want to call up the so-called tanker bill, which provides for 1 hour general debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And following consideration of the tanker bill?

Mr. ARENDS. I do not know how long these two will take and whether we will have time to go on with the next one or not.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The program for today will be improvised as we proceed?

Mr. ARENDS. Certainly we will let the gentleman know in ample time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3539) to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3539, with Mr. HOLMES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to revise upward the scale for computing reenlistment bonuses paid under the Career Compensation Act. Under the proposed legislation, payments will be based upon the number of years for which a person reenlists computed upon the grade in which an enlisted member is serving at the time his enlistment expires preceding his new reenlistment.

Likewise, since the first reenlistment rates are now running at a seriously low rate in comparison to second, third, and succeeding reenlistments, the amounts paid for reenlistments are greater for the first reenlistment and become progressively less for the second, third, and fourth reenlistments.

At present an individual who reenlists for a period of 2 years receives a bonus of $40; for 3 years, $90; for 4 years, $160; for five years, $250; and for 6 years, $360. These payments are made regardless of grade and regardless of whether or not it is a second, third, or fourth reenlistment. There is a present maximum bonus of $1,440 to any one individual.

Under the proposed legislation a person who, upon completing his first enlistment, reenlists for 2 to 6 years would receive 30 days' basic pay of his grade, times the number of years for which he reenlists, except that an E–1—that is, the lowest enlisted grade—would only receive two-thirds of a month's basic pay times the number of years for which he reenlists. Obviously, an individual who has not advanced beyond the grade of E–1 in his first enlistment has not satisfactorily progressed in the Armed Forces at least to the extent of entitlement to a higher reenlistment bonus. Upon the second reenlistment individuals receive 20 days' basic pay times the number of years of the reenlistment except that in this case no bonus is paid to individuals in the grades of E–1 or E–2—the two lowest enlisted grades. The third reenlistment entitles an individual to 10 days' basic pay times the number of years for which he reenlists, except that no bonus is paid to an individuad who is an E–3, E–2, or E–1. The fourth, and subsequent reenlistment entitles an individual to 5 days' basic pay times the number of years of the reenlistment contract except that no bonus is paid to E–3's, E–2's, or E–1's. The basic pay, of course, is determined by the grade in which serving at the time the present enlistment expires. The maximum amount of reenlistment bonuses to which an individual is entitled is $2,000, under the proposed legislation, an increase of $560 over the present limitation.

No reenlistment bonus accrues after the completion of 20 years of service, notwithstanding the maximum bonus allowance. In other words, an individual who reenlists in his 18th year for the fourth time will only be paid 2 years' reenlistment bonus, since all service beyond 20 years is noncreditable.

The new reenlistment bonus will not be applicable to anyone who is discharged more than 90 days preceding the date of enactment of the proposed legislation, and likewise will not be applicable to anyone who reenlists prior to the enactment of the proposed legislation. The Committee on Armed Services considered the feasibility of making the proposed legislation retroactive to include those who recently reenlisted and those discharged more than 90 days preceding the enactment of the legislation. The committee determined that such action was not feasible, since no cutoff date could be determined which would be fair to all persons involved.

The estimated annual cost is approximately $67,921,598 for fiscal year 1955.

The justification for the proposed legislation is to be found in the seriously declining reenlistment rates prevalent among all the services. It is estimated that a 5-percent increase in reenlistment rates would save the Government approximately $82 million in replacement costs. Thus, if the proposed legislation results in a 5-percent increase in reenlistment rates it will more than offset the annual cost of the proposed legislation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill S. 3539, is to increase the present reenlistment bonuses which are paid to individuals who reenlist in the Armed Forces.

Now the justification for this bill is simple. Our overall reenlistment rates have dropped from an average of 59 percent of those eligible during fiscal year 1950 to an average rate of only 31 percent in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1954. This is a staggering drop in reenlistment rates. It costs approximately $3,200 to obtain and train a replacement for a man who does not reenlist. Just think of that and you can easily understand why every reasonable effort should be expended in order to encourage men to reenlist.

Now that is all this bill does—it adds new inducements for enlisted men to make the services a career.

Not only does it save us the replacement cost, but it will also improve the overall capabilities of our Armed Forces if we can keep these men in the service who have been trained in the multitude of specialties that make up the requirements for our Armed Forces.

The cost of this bill, some $68 million a year, will be met if we can increase our reenlistment rates by 4½ percent over and above that which prevails today. Anything beyond that will result in substantial savings to the Government.

Now, I can assure you that the Committee on Armed Services weighed carefully the cost of the bill against the potential gain. We would not have reported the bill if we had concluded that the bill would not result in increasing our reenlistment rates, but we think that this bill will have the desired results.

Let us just take a look at what this bill does. Under present law when an individual reenlists it makes no difference what his rating is or whether it is the first, second, third, or fourth reenlistment or how many years of service he has. He gets $40 if he reenlists for 2 years, $90 if he reenlists for 3 years, $160 for a 4-year reenlistment, $250 for 5 years, and $360 if he reenlists for 6

years. The whole system will be changed under this bill. First of all, the amount of the reenlistment bonus will be determined by the rate or rank of the individual reenlisting, multiplied by the number of years for which he reenlists. And, secondly, the number of days' pay which he is given for each reenlistment, multiplied by the number of years of the reenlistment, decreases as the number of reenlistments increases. Now, let me give you some examples:

Let us say that a private first class in the Army is completing a 4-year enlistment and he wants to reenlist for 4 years. For pay purposes he has over 2 years of service but less than 4, so if he reenlists for 4 years he will receive the pay of a private first class with over 2 years of service, that is, $107 per month, multiplied by the 4 years for which he reenlists. That means he will receive $428. Under the old law he would have received only $160. Now, let us assume that that same man comes up for reenlistment again and by this time he is a sergeant and he wants to reenlist again for 4 years. He now has equity built up for retirement, so as a result, since it is his second reenlistment, he only gets 20 days' basic pay, or two-thirds of $168, which is $112, multiplied by the number of years for which he reenlists, which in this case would be 4 years times $112, or $448—a little more money because of his higher rating.

Now if that same man again reenlists for a third reenlistment and is a sergeant first-class, he will have over 10 years, but less than 12 years of service for pay purposes, but since it is his third reenlistment, he will receive only one-third of the pay of a sergeant first-class, or approximately $68, multiplied by the number of years for which he reenlists, or $272. The reason for this decrease is that he now has a greater equity built up toward retirement and the inducement can be lowered.

So you can see that the bulk of the money goes to the man who will reenlist for the first and second time. This is of fundamental importance because the largest group of potential reenlistees are those who complete their first enlistment, but this is also the lowest reenlistment rate for all of the services.

As a matter of fact, in fiscal 1954 only 20 percent of the individuals who completed their first enlistment who were eligible for reenlistment, actually did reenlist and the estimate for fiscal 1955 is only 10 percent—a fantastic drop from the even low rate which prevailed last year.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this bill, while costly, will result in large savings to the Government if it can increase our reenlistment rate by as little as 5 percent. Anything beyond that will result in substantial savings to the Federal Government.

Now I would like to discuss for a moment just how we arrive at the cost of this bill.

The estimate of the $68 million cost for the reenlistment bonus bill is based upon the expectation that approximately 243,000 enlisted men will reenlist during fiscal 1955. This will result in an increased cost per individual under the proposed legislation of approximately $278.83. In other words, the average cost under existing law is $258 per man to reenlist versus the anticipated average new cost under the new bill of $536.93. Thus if the anticipated number of men who reenlist is realized, the cost will be 243,593 times the increased cost of $278.83 per man, or $67,922,000.

In other words, the new bill will cost $68 million, based on the anticipated rate of reenlistments, which does not reflect the results of any increased reenlistments. If the proposed bill results in a 5 percent increase in reenlistment rates—approximately 26,000 more reenlistments—then there will be a reduction in replacement costs of approximately $83 million. The reenlistment bonus cost for this group would be $6,600,000 under present law and an additional $7 million under the proposed legislation, or a total of approximately $13,800,000. Since it would cost $83 million to replace these 25,000 individuals, it is obvious that the difference between the $13,800,000 in reenlistment bonuses and the $83 million in replacement costs would result in approximately $69 million savings, or the annual cost of the proposed legislation.

The average replacement cost of $3,200 per individual includes the cost associated with the individual's first 6 months of service while in training and travel status. Included in the cost are pay and allowances, recruiting and travel expense, pay and allowances for overhead personnel chargeable to training, a prorated portion of maintenance and operations costs chargeable to training as well as other identifiable miscellaneous costs.

I believe this will clarify any questions that may arise concerning the costs of the bill.

I heartily endorse the enactment of S. 3539.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I should like to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that it seems to me that one of the main reasons for the decline in enlistments is the low morale brought about by the taking away of the so-called fringe benefits which the enlisted personnel have been accustomed to. In other words they have had taken away the privileges of the PX, and such things as that, which has disturbed a great many of the enlisted personnel.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be correct as to other reasons why men are not reenlisting. I have not been addressing myself to that phase of it but have merely stated the facts; there are only 31 percent reenlisting. There may be various reasons why they do not reenlist and no doubt the reasons suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are some of them. We have tried to solve some of these problems of fringe benefits in previous bills reported by our committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I merely wanted to call that to the attention of the committee, because I think it is a serious matter. It is costing the Government a good bit of money because of the loss of these reenlistments.

Mr. VINSON. No doubt it has had some effect on the number of reenlistments. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] explained in considerable detail the workings of this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to ask the gentleman if this is not a correct statement: Upon the passage of this bill if there are no more reenlistments, then it will cost the Government not one penny; but if, on the other hand, this bill does induce a certain number to reenlist, it will do two things: First, it will save money; and, second, it will increase the standard of our service.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. In that connection, it costs approximately $3,200 to train 1 recruit. If we can get more men to reenlist we can save money on the training program.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The difference between the $3,200 and what the bonus would be.

Mr. VINSON. It could be figured that way.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of the Army, I should like to say that we are very cognizant of the poor rate of reenlistments that has prevailed over the past several years. We, as a committee, are very much disturbed about the situation. We are very conscious of the added cost that it takes to train new men, in addition to which, it takes trained people out of combat units where they could be doing a better job for the overall defense effort. I am sure that I speak for the three members on our side of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of the Army in endorsing this proposed legislation. We are more than glad to see this immediate outlay for, in the long run, it will cost less and give us a better Army for this country.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I think there is no need for me to take any further time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. I have no more requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 207 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (ch. 681, 63 Stat. 811), as amended (37 U. S. C. 238), is further amended by designating subsection "(e)" as subsection "(f)" and by inserting a new subsection (e), as follows:

"(e) This section does not apply to—

"(1) any person who originally enlists in a uniformed service after the date of enactment of this amendatory act;

"(2) any member of a uniformed service in active Federal service on the date of enactment of this amendatory act who elects

to be covered by section 208 of this act and who is otherwise eligible for the benefits of that section;

"(3) any person who—

"(A) was discharged or released from active duty from a uniformed service not more than 90 days before the date of enactment of this amendatory act,

"(B) reenlists in that service within 90 days after the date of his discharge or release from active duty,

"(C) elects to be covered by section 208 of this act, and

"(D) is otherwise eligible for the benefits of that section; or

"(4) any person covered by clause (2) or (3) who at any time elects, or has elected, to be covered by section 208 of this act."

SEC. 2. The Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by inserting the following new section at the end of title II:

"SEC. 208. (a) Subject to subsections (b) and (c) of this section, a member of a uniformed service who reenlists in the regular component of the service concerned within 90 days after the date of his discharge or release from active duty, and who is not covered by section 207 of this act, is entitled to a bonus computed according to the following table:

"Reenlistment involved [1]	(Column 1) Take	(Column 2) Multiply by
First	Monthly basic pay to which the member was entitled at the time of discharge.[2]	Number of years specified in reenlistment contract, or six, if none specified.[3]
Second	Two-thirds of the monthly basic pay to which the member was entitled at the time of discharge.[4]	Number of years specified in reenlistment contract, or six, if none specified.[3]
Third	One-third of the monthly basic pay to which the member was entitled at the time of discharge.[5]	Number of years specified in reenlistment contract, or six, if none specified.[3]
Fourth (and subsequent)	One-sixth of the monthly basic pay to which the member was entitled at the time of discharge.[4]	Number of years specified in reenlistment contract, or six, if none specified.[3]

[1] Any reenlistment when a bonus was not authorized is not counted.
[2] Two-thirds of the monthly basic pay in the case of a member in pay grade E–1 at the time of discharge.
[3] On the sixth anniversary of an indefinite reenlistment, and on each anniversary thereafter, the member is entitled to a bonus equal to one-third of the monthly basic pay to which he is entitled on that anniversary date.
[4] No bonus may be paid to a member in pay grade E–1 or E–2 at the time of discharge.
[5] No bonus may be paid to a member in pay grade E–1, E–2, or E–3 at the time of discharge.

"(b) No bonus may be paid to a member who reenlists—

"(1) during his prescribed period of basic recruit training; or

"(2) after completing a total of 20 years of active Federal service.

The bonus payable to a member who reenlists before completing a total of 20 years of active Federal service, but who will under that reenlistment complete more than 20 years of such service, is computed by using as a multiplier only that number of years which, when added to his previous service, totals 20 years.

"(c) The cumulative amount which may be paid to a member under this section, or under this section and any other provision of law authorizing reenlistment bonuses, may not exceed $2,000.

"(d) An officer of a uniformed service who reenlists in that active service within 90 days after his release from active duty as an officer is entitled to a bonus computed according to the table in subsection (a), if he served in an enlisted status in that service immediately before serving as an officer. For the purpose of this subsection, the monthly basic pay (or appropriate fraction if the member received a bonus for a prior reenlistment) of the grade in which the member is enlisted (computed in accordance with the cumulative years of service of the member) is to be used in column 1 of the table set forth under subsection (a) instead of the monthly basic pay to which he was entitled at the time of his release from active duty as an officer.

"(e) In this section, 'reenlistment' means—

"(1) an enlistment in a regular component of a uniformed service after compulsory or voluntary active duty in that service; or

"(2) a voluntary extension of an enlistment for 2 or more years.

"(f) Under such regulations as may be approved by the Secretary of Defense, or by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to Coast Guard personnel, a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily, or because of his own misconduct, does not complete the term of enlistment for which he was paid a bonus under this section shall refund that percentage of the bonus that the unexpired part of his enlistment is of the total enlistment period for which the bonus was paid.

"(g) The Secretary concerned may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section in his Department."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have only a few remarks to make on this bill, and those of a commendatory nature. I think the bill addresses itself to a very serious question, and that it is a decided step in the right direction in helping solve one of the problems confronting those who are members of our armed services.

I recall reading not long ago some remarks made by Secretary Talbott of the Air Force. I think the remarks he made were uttered in Texas, but that is immaterial. I was very much impressed by what he said in the course of his remarks to the effect that the reenlistments in the Air Force had declined from 60 percent to 30 percent. He also said that if we could get the reenlistments up to 80 percent in the Air Force, it would result in a saving to the Government each year of from $1.5 to $2 billions. That saving would come about if we could keep our trained men in the service and give them reasonable inducements to reenlist. These trained men feel they cannot reenlist, for any number of reasons, and there is the necessity for the Government to spend more money to train new men.

Secretary Talbott's observation made a very pointed impression upon my mind. I take these few minutes to call the attention of my colleagues to this very effective, informative, and impressive speech made by Secretary Talbott, which certainly is of great significance in connection with the bill that is before the Committee of the Whole at the present time.

This bill is far more important than its terms and provisions would indicate. Its significance cannot be underestimated. It is a decided step in the right direction, not only in keeping trained personnel in our armed services through offering them an inducement to reenlist, but also in conveying to them the fact that the Congress of the United States is considering not only the problems that confront them as members of the various branches of the armed services but the economic problems that confront the families of each of them. I congratulate the committee on reporting out this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair Mr. HOLMES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3539) to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1939, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to House Resolution 624, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF TANKERS

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 625) providing for the consideration of S. 3458, a bill to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 625, which will make

in order the consideration of the bill S. 3458, to authorize the long-term charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy and for other purposes.

House Resolution 625 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3458 proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to charter on a time-charter basis for a period of 10 years from completion, 20 tankers each with a capacity of approximately 25,000 deadweight tons. These tankers would be capable of a sustained speed of not less than 18 knots and would be built in American shipyards within 2 years after the contract to charter.

As the Senate passed the bill, Mr. Speaker, S. 3458 would provide that upon being awarded a time charter, a private operator with whom such contract was made, would proceed with the construction of the vessel. Upon completion, the vessel would be operated for the United States Military Sea Transportation Service during the time-charter period in meeting the requirements of our Armed Forces for petroleum products. Upon expiration of the charter period, unless the charter were renewed, the vessel would revert to private use.

During the operation of the tanker for the Military Sea Transportation Service, under time charter, the private operator would pay the expenses of insurance, overhead, repairs, and maintenance of the ships as well as the wages of the crew and other expenses. The private operator would also absorb depreciation, interest and similar financial expenses of the investment in the tankers.

The House Committee on Armed Services, however, struck all after the enacting clause in the Senate bill because the committee disapproved of the fact that under the Senate plan after the 10-year charter period was over, the ships would not belong to the United States although two-thirds of their cost would have been amortized over the 10-year period through payments by the United States under the charter contract. The report brought out the fact that the House plan of direct construction of these tankers with appropriated funds will cost the United States $95,000 less per ship or a total of $19 million over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House plan is a good one and that it makes sense from the point of view of practical business. There is no point in not actually owning these tankers after the Government pays about two-thirds of the cost involved in the amortization of these vessels. The House committee's plan seems to me to be a happy compromise and appears to be worthy of favorable action by the House. I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill itself will pass.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York just explained, this bill authorizes the construction of a fleet of modern, fast, tanker ships of some 25,000-ton capacity. The bill has a twofold purpose. One is to give the Navy the necessary tankers to carry the fuel which is needed in the operation of our Navy to any and all parts of the world wherever it may be required. Unfortunately, with the rapid progress and advancement of science in all fields, including weapons, transportation, and so on, many types of equipment rapidly become obsolete. While the Navy now has a dozen tankers, mostly in mothballs, they do not have the modern tankers necessary to deal with present-day operations. Therefore, if an emergency should arise we would be caught with too little and too late, as we all know has happened in the past. Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that there is considerable difference in the bill as passed by the other body and the bill as reported out by the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Personally, I am of the opinion, from my knowledge of the subject, that the House bill is a great improvement over the Senate bill, in that under the House version of the bill the Navy will build and operate these tankers, rather than as provided under the Senate bill, having them under charter. In the long run, the Government will save money on this operation, and in my opinion it is a much better bill.

The second purpose of the bill, while it may be considered a minor purpose, is nevertheless a necessary purpose. That objective is to keep our shipyards alerted, and to keep the shipyard organization going to furnish employment so that if we should get into an emergency we would have an organization which could build the necessary ships.

Again, Mr. Speaker, and in this connection I hope that I can with propriety point out that this means that the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., situated in my hometown of Pascagoula, Miss., will have an opportunity to bid upon and construct some of these valuable ships. I mention this particular yard because of its valuable contribution to our defense effort in the past at a time when we needed good ships and needed them in a hurry. This yard met the test. It has not only built merchant ships, but it has built ships for our Navy. Because of the splendid labor supply and the high character of its ship construction, it enjoys an unexcelled rating with both the Merchant Marine and Navy Departments of our Government as well as private owners.

Mr. Speaker, while I stated a few moments ago the philosophy of the House bill is different from the bill passed by its companion body, I anticipate no difficulty in the two bodies getting together in conference on a bill which will be to the best interest of the country. Certainly this should be done speedily in order that the necessary appropriations can be included in the usual supplemental appropriation bill to be passed before the Congress adjourns. In view of the great need and necessity therefor, I feel confident that this will be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, there is really no controversy over this rule. I anticipate none on the bill itself. I have no request for time on this side and I therefore yield back the remainder of my time in order that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] may ask for the adoption of the rule.

While unquestionably much progress has been made in faster, more efficient and more deadly submarines, and while it is equally true that newer and more efficient methods have been developed in antisubmarine warfare, there seems to be no doubt left in the minds of our military strategists that there is still a great demand for speed as an additional method for our merchant shipping as heretofore. There was testimony before the Committee for the need for new, large, and fast tankers which should be immediately available as an important part of our national defense.

The bill which this resolution takes under consideration makes provision for such ships. In fact, it provides for a program of 20 tankers with a deadweight tonnage of 25,000 tons, a speed of not less than 18 knots when fully loaded, a length of approximately 600 feet, a beam not in excess of 84 feet, and a draft of not more than 32 feet fully loaded.

It is estimated that the overall cost will be $150 million.

Mr. Speaker, I should specifically like to commend the Committee on Armed Services for writing into the bill a provision requiring that these ships be built in the United States. Moreover, it is also commendable that there was testimony to the effect that these ships in line with the policy of keeping our shipyards in an ever-alerted position would be constructed in various sections of the country. This is fair and just. This means that these valuable ships will be built in yards on the Gulf of Mexico as well as on the east and possibly the west coast. It means valuable employment for our shipyards' workers in a slack period. It means a continuous supply of available shipbuilding personnel and labor generally.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3458, with Mr. LECOMPTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, S. 3458 would provide for the construction of 20 high-speed tankers which are urgently needed by the Military Sea Transportation Service.

The Senate version of the bill would have authorized the Secretary of the Navy to enter into 10-year charter agreements with private individuals who would have these tankers built and then operate them for the MSTS for 10 years at a rate not to exceed $5 per deadweight ton per month.

The House version, and I might say it was by a unanimous vote, struck all of the Senate language and inserted new language which would authorize the direct construction of these tankers in the traditional manner of naval construction.

The reason for the committee action was twofold. First, it will save money, at least $19 million in the first 10 years; and second, it will permit a distribution of the construction throughout the shipyards in the United States.

From the testimony received during the hearings on this measure, it was the opinion of the members that there was no evidence whatsoever that the best interests of the Government would be served by the charter plan. There is no doubt as to the need for the tankers. The only doubt which has existed has been the manner in which they would be provided.

It is true, and the committee took full cognizance of the fact, that the charter plan does not require an immediate appropriation of funds. Certainly this is important. But I felt, and all of the members of the committee felt, that this consideration was far outweighed by the ultimate cost to the Government.

During the 10-year charter period, the Government would spend some $300 million, amortize for the operator two-thirds of his investment in each tanker, and end up owning nothing. This does not seem like sound business to me.

Under the House plan, the tankers will be identical in design, will be operated in the same fashion as under the charter plan, and will be owned by the Navy immediately and forever.

The charter plan has all of the advantages, and more importantly, disadvantages, of any leasing arrangement. It must cost more in the long run and in this case, it does not ever have the advantage of ultimate ownership—under the charter plan, the owner of the charter takes his tanker, the cost of which has been two-thirds amortized, and proceeds to use it for an additional 10 years. It is not too much of a stretch of the actual facts to say that the operator gets a $7½ million tanker for $2½ million.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but feel that the House version of this bill is the right one.

Comparative cost per day

	Private	Government	Remarks
Subsistence	$90	$100	
Insurance (hull and machinery)	200	120	This is not actual insurance but rather the amount of repairs normally covered by insurance. No overhead is included.
Insurance (protection and indemnity)	75	45	This is insurance taken out through the Department of Commerce. No overhead or profit is included which explains lower cost.
War risk insurance	65	39	This insurance also is procured through the Department of Commerce. No overhead or profit is included.
Contractor's fixed fee	0	75	This is the fee paid per day to the Government's operator. Other expenses are reimbursed. In effect, this is a CPFF contract.
Interest	520	309	The difference here is explained by the fact that the private owner would pay 4 percent on money borrowed or invested while the Government would pay only 2⅜ percent for its borrowing.
Total	950	688	

$950−$688=$262×365=$95,630 per ship per year.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to compliment the gentleman for his clear and concise statement and to emphasize the fact that not only will this build up a reserve of first-class tankers, but the bill provides that they shall be built in the yards of this country and it will mean much to employment in the shipbuilding industry.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I want to commend the gentleman and the committee on the provision requiring these ships to be built in the yards of this country. If we are going to furnish the rest of the world with arms, housing, food, and everything else, we are going to have to put a little fat on the folks at home so we can provide the things for others.

Mr. ARENDS. I want to thank the gentleman for his statement and say that I think we have taken a very practical approach to this whole problem.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, MSTS was created by a directive of the Secretary of Defense in 1949 under authority granted to him by the National Security Act. It performs all of the sea transportation for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. MSTS operates 53 Government-owned T–2 tankers. It also has under lease 4 supertankers, giving it a total fleet today of 57 tankers. All of the Government-owned tankers are small, slow, and over half their useful life is gone. It has in reserve 12 tankers, but 8 of these are minor types, 2 are Liberty ships converted to distilling ships, and the remaining 2 ships, built early in World War II, are badly damaged and not capable of speeds in excess of 12 knots.

So you can see we have virtually no reserve fleet.

When the 20 tankers authorized by this bill are built, MSTS will take 37 of its 53 Government-owned tankers out of operation and place them in reserve. That will give them a reserve fleet of 49 tankers. The 16 remaining plus the new 20 will give them an operating fleet of 36. I am not now counting the 4 tankers that are under a 5-year lease.

Thirty-seven T–2 tankers can be replaced by 20 of the new ones because each of the new ones carries almost twice the cargo of the T–2 even though its complement is approximately the same and uses only one-third more fuel. Understand that under both the Senate and the House versions of the bill, the tankers which would be built are identical. Also, the objectives of the two versions are the same, that is, to build up our tanker reserve and to stimulate, protect, and preserve our shipbuilding industry.

Let us look at the differences between the House and Senate versions. Under the Senate bill, the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to enter into charter agreements for a period of 10 years—the commercial life of one of these tankers is about 20 years. Under this plan, the successful bidders would build 20 tankers and operate them for MSTS at about $5 per deadweight ton per month—deadweight tonnage is the total lifting capacity of a ship, which includes everything in the ship but not the weight of the ship itself.

Let us see what this charter plan means from a money standpoint: the tonnage of the ship is 25,000 which, multiplied by $5 per ton, is $125,000 per month for 1 tanker. Twelve times $125,000 is $1,500,000 for 1 year for 1 tanker. Multiply this by 10 years and you get $15 million paid out by the Government for each ship. For 20 ships, this means the Government would pay out $300 million for a mere service. It would never own a single ship.

When the Armed Services Committee figured out these costs, there was only one answer: Build the ships in traditional Navy fashion and operate them in the regular way with merchant seamen. Under the House bill, therefore, the Navy, through the Maritime Commission, would build these 20 tankers at a cost of about $7½ million each or a total of $150 million. This will mean that not only will the Government own the tankers right from the beginning, but will save $95,000 each year on each tanker or a total of $19 million during the first 10 years of ownership. This saving represents almost three new tankers itself.

The Senate version, to my mind, has three major weaknesses. First, it will cost the Government $300 million in 10 years and not a single ship will be owned; second, it would encourage successful charterers to place 1 or 2 of their older ships under foreign flag to

operate in competition with our merchant fleet; and three, it would give no assurance at all that the construction of the ships would be spread throughout the country so as to stimulate the shipbuilding industry.

Simple arithmetic, good business, and common sense dictate the acceptance of the House version.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, one of the most vital requirements for our national defense is a modern fleet of fast tankers. The bill S. 3458 would partially meet this urgent requirement.

Our present American tanker fleet, private- and Government-owned, is comprised principally of tankers built in World War II, which have sustained sea speeds of 14½ knots.

This is an age of speed. We are building faster automobiles, faster airplanes, and faster ships. Generally speaking, the tankers which are being built throughout the world are larger and faster than those which were built during 1942–45.

Our modern airplanes and ships require more oil than did those of 10 years ago. In the event of another national emergency, our worldwide commitments will require that we support our fleet and our Air Force in the four corners of the world. At the present time, American operators are faced with competition from foreign operators who have larger, faster tankers. Thus, larger, faster tankers are needed to compete with foreign competition.

With the improvements being made in submarines, it is obvious that our present tankers of 14½-knot speeds are much too slow. What is needed is a fleet of faster tankers with speeds of 18 knots or better, which would be capable of delivering oil to our military quickly and safely. In time of war, speed is one of the best defenses against a submarine. The 20 fast tankers contemplated under S. 3458 would, in my opinion, be a step in the right direction. These fast tankers would be a valuable addition to our American tanker fleet during peacetime. In time of war, the faster tankers would be available for use in hazardous areas, while the slower 14½-knot tankers could be used in areas where the threat of submarines was not so great.

We must not hesitate any longer to begin to modernize our fleet with these fast tankers. I, therefore, am in favor of S. 3458.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express complete agreement with other members of the committee that this action is needed now. In my opinion, we have an unusually good bill and it is one that deserves the unanimous support of the Members of this House.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with those who have spoken in favor of the pending bill. It was my pleasure to sit in and to listen to the witnesses in many of the committee hearings because we are vitally concerned with the entire program.

I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not want my friends over here to hurry me, either. I was going to ask permission to speak out of order, but I guess I will not.

It is all right to build these tankers. I think we need them and, confining myself to an argument in favor of the bill, I suggest that we should make some provision to, in some way, have the ships manned. I know this is a mechanical age and we do not need very much manual labor any more. War has changed, they tell me, so they have this push-button war and they will not need any private soldiers after a while, to carry on a war which will be a welcome thought to some of our farmers as well as to the parents, wives, and children.

REFORMATION? REAL OR SYNTHETIC

After years of deliberation, on May 17 last, the Supreme Court solemnly and unanimously announced that segregation was illegal. Discrimination because of race, creed, or color in educational, amusement, and social programs, is unlawful.

But neither the Congress nor the courts have had the inclination, or perhaps the courage, to ban discrimination in man's most necessary activity.

Ever since Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden, man—yellow, black, or white—unless he was the recipient of charity or a thief, was forced to work if he would eat, have clothing, and shelter to keep him confortable.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding, since the enactment of the Hobbs amendment to the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 which was made necessary by a decision of the Supreme Court declaring organized extortion by labor unions to be a legitimate, legal practice, some unions and more recently the Teamsters Union, headed by Dave Beck, have throughout the Nation, sometimes by force and violence or by fear, sometimes by economic pressure, forced men—yes, and women—yellow, black, or white, Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, to pay tribute to the union if they would work.

Millions, perhaps billions, have been collected from businessmen and the Government itself, from individuals who either wanted to work to earn a livelihood or to carry on a recognized, legitimate business.

The average armed robber is a merciful gentleman compared to the collectors of the Teamsters Union.

The robber merely asks you to stand and deliver on a particular occasion.

The racketeering union officials compel you to pay their demands periodically, either from week to week or from month to month.

This form of extortion has been nationwide and while, here and there, individuals have been arrested and convicted by able, courageous, law-enforcing officials, the practice as a whole has not been successfully opposed.

Early in 1953 special subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor and of the Committee on Government Operations held joint hearings and made a start—a very, very slight one—in an effort to call public attention to the vicious practices above referred to.

A few racketeering officials apparently had influence enough to kill off those investigations which had resulted in the indictment of a few individuals, most of whom have, for some unforeseen and unexplained reason, been acquitted or had the charges against them dropped.

More recently the House Committee on Government Operations authorized a special subcommittee to reenter the racketeering field.

Ten days ago preliminary investigation made by me personally indicated that the teamsters had either reformed or put on a cease-extortion program. It is my hope that, if the former was not the real reason for their more recent policy, the latter situation will be permanent.

What do I mean? I cite four examples of reformation or the effect of threatened law enforcement:

First. The Teamsters Union, working out of South Bend and Hammond, Ind., recently put on a drive to organize the small Michigan dairies which purchase milk, sell it to individuals or corporations who in turn, using their own equipment, sell it to whomever wants to buy.

Independent businessmen in order to obtain dairy products were forced by union representatives to pay a monthly tribute to the union in order to continue in business.

However, after an inquiry into that situation was started, the union apparently called off its collecting officers.

Second. Another illustration of repentance or of the effect of threatened law enforcement: In Pennsylvania, truckers attempting to unload poultry hauled in from Southern States were denied that right unless tribute was paid to union officials. Recently that practice has been at least temporarily discontinued.

Third. Within the last 2 weeks drivers of truckloads of produce from Georgia to Minnesota were advised that the drive to collect an unloading fee or to force the drivers into a union was off and that, for the time being, there would be no more collections for the right to deliver merchandise there.

I have now been advised that the union officials are harassing nonunion drivers by making complaints to representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, charging violations of traffic regulations.

Fourth. A letter from a statewide truck owners organization in Ohio, where nonunion drivers from other States as well as from Ohio were previously forced to pay tribute for the privilege of driving on State and Federal highways and for the exercise of their right to unload merchandise, carries this concluding paragraph:

We find a slackening of this extortion racket from reports all over the country and all credit must be given to you people for

this pleasant development. Hope you continue.

This organization had previously filed with us affidavits by truckdrivers and businessmen, showing that the Teamsters Union operating in Ohio had compelled, by force or threat of force, nonunion drivers to make cash payments before they were permitted to unload their cargo—a practice which, under the Hobbs amendment, is characterized as extortion or robbery.

It would be egotistical to agree with the conclusion of the Ohio letter that the racketeering of the teamsters has been lessened because of anticipated congressional investigations and it is my hope, as I am sure it is that of all law-abiding citizens, that the teamsters and, for that matter, all other unions, have seen the inequity, the unlawful aspect, of the practice, without authority of law, through the power of organized labor, of levying tribute upon individuals in order that they may exercise their right to work or engage in business.

Ever since 1937, I have been wondering when the Congress and the Supreme Court would get around to protect the right of the woman or the man who is forced to earn a livelihood by manual labor to find and work at a job of his own choosing without being robbed—as defined by the Hobbs Antiracketeering Act—each month of a part of his wage. When is discrimination against him to end?

Apparently, the force of public opinion created by the publicity given by the press to the illegal activities of a few gangsters, as disclosed by the committee, has forced them temporarily to discontinue the practice—this either because they have recognized the enormity of their offense or because they fear what might happen.

If workers in mass-production industries are to be protected, unions are a necessity, but, to be effective, their officers must live within the law.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services is perhaps the most powerful committee in Congress. It is composed of outstanding Members of Congress. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is one of its most powerful members and one of the most powerful Members of Congress. He is a great gentleman and his name will live long after him.

One would be almost foolish, indeed, to oppose that committee with respect to this House version of the tanker bill which the Armed Services Committee adopted under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. But I would not be worth my salt and I would not be justified in being a Member of this Congress if I did not get up and express my views with respect to this bill.

I agree with the objectives of the bill. We need some new tankers and we need them desperately. The National Security Council has so indicated. Representatives of the armed services have come before our committee and so indicated. I am convinced that we need some new tankers; there is no question about it. Also we need the construction work that would follow as a result of deciding to build these tankers. Our shipyards are in a deplorable and desperate situation, and unless we do something to alleviate that situation we will endanger our defense program. So I am in accord with the objectives of this bill. But I differ with the Committee on Armed Services with respect to how these tankers should be built.

Under the House version, the Government will build the tankers. Under the Senate version, the tankers would be built by private enterprise. Let me say that the bill before the House today is not the Administration bill. It is not the bill supported by the Secretary of Commerce. It is not the bill supported by the Secretary of the Navy.

I am disturbed because over the years and between wars the Congress of the United States neglects its private American merchant marine. We have done so traditionally, and we are in the midst of doing so again. Every time we have done it we have found ourselves in trouble whenever an emergency broke cut.

We do not have, when emergencies come upon us, the merchant ships, the merchant fleet, to carry the men and materials to the war fronts. Congress has on many occasions said that it was the policy of Congress to have a strong, privately owned merchant fleet to carry the cargoes of this country in times of peace and to serve as an auxiliary in times of war. But Congress fails to fully effectuate that policy.

Under this bill what are we doing? We are making possible a Government-owned and Government-operated merchant fleet. We have one in the course of making now in the Military Sea Transport Service. Of course, many persons will agree that we should have a nucleus Military Sea Transport Service fleet. But the Military Sea Transport Service now consists of 295 vessels, 232 of them owned by the American Government. In the course of time, if Congress continues to neglect the private American merchant marine, we are going to have a completely Government-owned and Government-operated merchant marine, which is in the course of being now and growing rapidly through the MSTS operations. A Government-owned merchant fleet will cost us much more over the years because we will pay all the costs. If we have a private fleet all the costs except subsidy are paid for by private enterprise.

This bill will present some problems. If we need tankers and if we are going to build them in American shipyards in order to give them work, we are going to have a problem, because this bill will require an appropriation before the end of this year; and there is some doubt that it will be forthcoming in the sum of some $150 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the gentleman is correct. But under the charter plan you would have to do that each year under an appropriation bill and no one would know anything about it. So the way to do anything is to do it directly and not by subterfuge. The gentleman knows that it would ultimately cost a great deal more to have these tankers built by charterers than it will cost for the Government to do it in the manner that we propose.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I would take strong issue with the gentleman on that. I would say that quite the contrary is true. The program as provided in this bill will inevitably cost the Federal Government more. We have had testimony in our committee concerning the Military Sea Transportation Service operations for many weeks, and no representative of the MSTS, and that includes Admiral Denebrink, and no representative of the Defense Department, disputes the fact that private operators can build and operate these vessels cheaper than the Government can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Let me state what the Department said. The Department said they could operate these ships, and the admiral so testified, at $95,000 per ship per year less than they could under the charter. So in the 10 years you would save $19 million. You would save $1,900,000 a year by the Government's operating them instead of doing it under charter operation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I ask the gentleman a question there?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Was that Admiral Denebrink's testimony?

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely, that is his testimony. I will put it in the RECORD. He draws the comparison.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Let me comment on that. According to the bookkeeping of the MSTS, it would be cheaper for MSTS to take one of their ships and run it from the United States to Korea, deliver its cargo, sink the ship, send the men back home to the United States by some other vessel, and buy a new one when they got back than to return the original vessel. That is so simply because of the kind of bookkeeping MSTS does. And what I say about its bookkeeping methods is no reflection on Admiral Denebrink who is a very efficient and able officer.

According to their bookkeeping, they do not take into consideration the original investment of $150 million, they do not take into consideration depreciation, they do not take into consideration the fact that they pay no taxes, they do not take into consideration the fact that they pay no insurance. Nor do they consider as part of their costs the cost of using Navy personnel in operating some of their vessels. In the long run, in the 10-year period or the 20-year period, those costs are going to be paid by Congress, by the American people, in some other form.

Mr. VINSON. If we do pay for it we own it. Under the charter plan, we will pay an exorbitant price for it and will own nothing.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I dislike to disagree with the gentleman. On the basis

of testimony taken over many weeks in our committee, I must say that the MSTS cannot possibly compete with private operation in the operation of these vessels. In the final analysis the House bill will not only cost more than the Senate bill, but it is entirely possible that we will have to wait until next year before any appropriations are made. If so, we will not start any tanker construction this year.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, so the figures will be before the Committee correctly, here is the table that was prepared by the Admiral. It is estimated it will cost the charterer $950 per day to operate one of these tankers, and it will cost the Government $688 a day, a difference of $260. That per year would be $95,630 cheaper for the Government to operate them, and these figures apply to each tanker.

Now, I want to get this across to you: These tankers are 25,000 tons. We pay $5 a ton per month. That is $125,000 for the tanker per month. For 12 months that would be $1,500,000 that the tanker would cost for serving the Government during that period of time. There are 20 tankers involved. It would cost the Government during the 10-year period $300 million, and at the end of the 10-year period the Government would have nothing whatsoever. That is the whole story.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. What is the difference between the method of building these ships and other ordinary ships, because if the gentleman's argument holds for these particular tankers, why does not the gentleman's argument hold for every kind of ship?

Mr. VINSON. It does hold for everything related to the Navy. Never before in the history of this Government have Navy ships, ships built and designed for the Navy, ever been operated on a charter basis.

Mr. FULTON. Would not your argument then aply to all private shipping?

Mr. VINSON. No, not at all.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a little time to go into the question of a privately owned and operated merchant marine or the proposal now before us. I will start off by saying there is no question in my mind, or in the mind of any informed person I know, but what we need a tanker program of some kind. We need these tankers quickly. The shipyards need the work. I believe the tanker tonnage that we are now short is approximately 1,250,000 tons. Any program which will get tankers building and under way immediately has a great deal of virtue. I do think, however, these two different approaches should be compared. I have great respect for the opinions of the gentleman from Georgia and the information that he has although, I must say, I cannot be in complete agreement. For the past 3 months, I have been holding hearings as chairman of a subcommittee on the Military Sea Transportation Service in its relationship to the merchant marine. I say quite frankly I doubt that anyone can make a fair comparison of the costs. I will give one example. In the transportation of men in troopships, the privately operated lines conduct the entire operation of solicitation, handling of dockside facilities and of all things other than and including the running of the ship. The MSTS on a similar operation gives the cost of the passengers carried, but only while they are on the ship and all of the other costs are borne by other branches of the services. The cost of the uniformed personnel involved in military sea transport operations is not added to the cost of the transportation, and possibly rightly so, but the costs, I think, are definitely not comparable.

In this program, the initial outlay for tankers by the Government under the administration proposal would be no outlay at all. Under the proposal of the House committee, the outlay would be approximately $150 million. Under the other program, we would pay part of that $150 million back through charter hire, covering depreciation over a period of years. I would disagee with the gentleman from Georgia because I think, probably, the depreciation which would be included in charter hire would come closer to a 20-year depreciation than the figure which he mentioned. In other words, in my opinion we would write off approximately $7,500,000 a year instead of a cost of $150 million now. As to what we end up with, I think we end up about the same in either case. To me, it is not particularly important that the Government should own the ships. I think it is far more important to have merchant ships sailing and in condition and in operation than it is for the Government to own them. I think this bill reported by the committee would have been improved had it provided in some way for an alternative program under which we could use either the direct approach of this committee bill or the approach in the bill of the other body using the private funds that could be brought in.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In regard to the suggestion that the gentleman has just made, I would say that that should be left to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, if the ships are to be used for that purpose. What we are charged with is the responsibility for building Navy ships and these are Navy ships.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I would quite agree with the gentleman except for the fact that in time of war the merchant marine is a military auxiliary under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In time of war, the merchant marine carries the cargo and the supplies of the military forces. Admiral Denebrink only said within the last week that he thought the chief reliance for the carriage of cargo would have to be put on the berth liner service operated by the merchant marine. He pointed out to us that in the past 3 months the percentage of cargo which he has assigned to berth liners has been increased from 52 percent to over 70 percent of the total, which I think is a step in the right direction, and builds up the military potential in this country in far better shape than the Government operation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The gentleman loses sight of the fact that these are specially designed, high-speed tankers. These tankers are being built to meet certain military requirements on account of the submarine menace.

Mr. ALLEN of California. With all deference to the gentleman, the merchant-marine type of tanker which has been built recently is larger and faster and just as well built to take military cargoes as the one proposed.

Mr. VINSON. I am willing to agree that they are 32,000 ton, but they are not otherwise as acceptable.

Mr. ROOI'EY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder how academic all this discussion is. The instant bill would authorize construction of 20 tankers at a cost of $150,000,000. At the present time a majority of the Committee on Appropriations is reluctant to even appropriate 3 whale boats for our merchant marine.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Commenting on that, I think a great deal of effort has yet to be made to indicate to some members of the Committee on Appropriations that the need is greater than they think.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman I have done my best.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I would be glad to assist the gentleman in that effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration is one of tremendous importance, first, to our national defense; and, second, to the shipbuilding industry.

The bill (S. 3458) authorizes the President to undertake the construction of not to exceed 20 tankers. The tankers are to be approximately 25,000 deadweight tons each, shall have a speed of not less than 18 knots, and shall be constructed in private shipyards within the continental United States. Furthermore, the tankers shall be, so far as practicable, of materials and equipment produced or manufactured in the United States. An appropriation not to exceed $150 million is authorized.

As of December 31, 1953, there was in our national defense reserve fleet a total

of only 12 tankers; 8 of these are of minor types, 2 are Liberty ships converted to distilling ships, and the remaining 2 ships, built early in the war, are badly damaged and are not capable of speeds in excess of 12 knots. Thus, for all practicable purposes, we have no tanker reserve. The program proposed by the bill now under consideration provides a partial means to meet this need.

This deficiency in numbers is only one aspect of the overall problem. Most of the tankers presently in the United States-flag fleet have a sustained speed of only 14½ knots or less.

While the great strides we have taken in antisubmarine warfare are encouraging, there is no substitute for speed, insofar as decreasing the vulnerability of merchant shipping is concerned. There is an urgent need for new, large, and fast tankers to be immediately available in support of our national defense in the event of war.

CONSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN SHIPYARDS

Equally important with need of these tankers from the standpoint of national security is the need for ship construction that now exists in our American shipyards.

There is no denying the fact that our shipyards are facing a serious situation as a result of lack of work. Management and men are insistent, and rightfully so, that there be a program of ship construction started at once. Unless such is done, many yards will be compelled to close down, with resultant unemployment to thousands of shipworkers.

It is just as important to keep a competent shipworkers force ready and able to form a working nucleus ready for expansion in time of emergency as to keep our Armed Forces in a state of readiness to respond immediately. The same reasons justify both. A shipbuilder cannot be made overnight. They are skilled workers. It takes years of apprenticeship and additional years to attain the necessary skill in the numerous and varied trades that are required in the construction of ships.

Time and again we have seen emergencies break upon us that have required ships. Often we have not had them to adequately measure up to the need. This has necessitated our entering upon a hurry-up program that has caused us to spend millions of dollars preparing a sufficient number of men to do the work of shipbuilding and thereby causing extended delay in obtaining the necessary ships. However, if a sufficient working force can be kept busy at all times we are then ready at a moment's notice to expand and begin the building of ships. This can be accomplished by a program that keeps our shipyards busy with work. The pending bill will provide such a work program. Therefore, it is vital to our welfare and should have the support of every Member of Congress. It will mean strengthening our national security and, what is exceedingly important at this time, will provide work for many shipyard workers who now face unemployment.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few remarks on the need for the tankers which would be provided by this bill.

As a result of our efforts during World War II, the size of the American tanker fleet reached an all-time high in 1945, at which time over 50 percent of world-wide tanker tonnage was under the American flag.

At the present time, however, the tanker tonnage under the American flag constitutes only about 25 percent of the world's tanker tonnage.

Since 1945 the world tanker tonnage has increased almost 10 million deadweight tons, and this increase resulted from postwar construction the majority of which is registered under foreign flags. During this same period the tonnage under American flags has been reduced about 33 percent. This reduction has been brought about by sales to foreign operators and by transfers from American to foreign-flag registry. However, construction in foreign countries is in full swing while our American shipyards are being operated on a limited scale. In addition, only about 5 percent of the tankers which were being built in American shipyards in 1953 were destined for American registry.

The majority of our American tanker fleet consists of ships which were built during World War II. These ships are of 16,500 deadweight tons and 14½ knots speed. The present trend in tankers which are being built today is toward larger, faster tankers such as are envisioned under S. 3458.

The overall situation is that the tanker fleets of foreign countries are expanding and being modernized while our American fleet is not keeping pace with the rest of the world and is facing block obsolescence within the next 10 years.

Furthermore, the present American tanker fleet, private and Government-owned, built and under construction, is about 1½ million deadweight tons short of meeting our initial minimum requirements in the event of a national emergency. This shortage is equivalent to approximately 90 of our present World War II built tankers.

Not only do we need more modern fast tankers to supplement our fleet, but we need them to assist in overcoming the present plight of our American shipyards.

The 20 tankers contemplated under this bill will not be a cure-all for the present plight of our merchant fleet. It will, however, be a step in the right direction to modernize the fleet, reduce the threat of block obsolescence, and stimulate our shipbuilding industry.

I believe our national interest requires that we build these tankers immediately. I intend to vote favorably on S. 3458 and I urge all of my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I would like to make the comment, Mr. Chairman, that if the Senate bill were eventually adopted it would be well to add to it a simple amendment to restrict the transfer of any tanker involved to another flag.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill because it has been repeatedly testified by officials of the Navy Department and the Department of Defense that the most critical shortage in the entire marine picture is in reserve tanker capacity.

It has been testified that we have insufficient tankers today to meet the initial mobilization impact in case of getting into trouble.

As the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has pointed out, there are practically no tankers at all in our reserve fleet at this time, and there is urgent and immediate need for faster and more modern tankers.

I urge the adoption of this legislation also because of the plight at the present time of our ship construction industry.

I suppose that this industry is perhaps the most distressed industry in the entire Nation at this time.

Not a single commercial contract for construction, I am advised, has been placed in the last 18 months. As of January first next there will be only two commercial ships under construction on all the ways in this broad land of ours.

The unemployment situation among our skilled workers essential to national defense is becoming tragic.

As Admiral Leggett, head of the Bureau of Ships, has pointed out:

> The current and prospective scarcity of commercial ship construction constitutes a serious threat to our national security.

If things continue as they are now we simply are not going to have the mobilization base in terms of ship construction that is essential.

To allow essential shipyards to fold up at this time is contrary to our entire national defense policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am one who has believed that the administration proposal approved by the Senate is far more acceptable than the proposal of the House which is now before us.

I agree very largely with the sentiments expressed by the able gentleman from Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. TOLLEFSON.

It seems to me if we can secure 20 tankers through private financing, for which we simply have to pay charter hire over a period of years without any immediate appropriation, that that is something we should be grateful for.

I believe it will cost less money, that it will assure action at this session of the Congress, that it will stimulate private enterprise, and that it will contribute immediately to the result which I am sure we all have at heart.

I am going to vote to send this bill to conference in the fervent hope that matters can be so adjusted there that this Congress will enact into law a bill which will bring about the construction which is so vital from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. The thing that has concerned me about this particular bill, and which I discussed at least in the committee, was whether or not this particular bill would cause tankers to be constructed. The hour is late in this particular session; I do not know what the Appropriations Committee of this House is going to do, or what the views may be of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

And regardless of what has been said here today I think the other proposal perhaps would be cheaper than this.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me that there is no objection which has been raised to the Senate proposal that cannot be met by a reasonable modification in the language of the Senate bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy or such officer as he shall designate is authorized to enter into contracts upon such terms as the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to be in the best interests of the Government for the time charter to the Navy of not to exceed 20 tankers not now in being for periods of not more than 10 years to commence upon tender of the tankers for service after completion of construction. In awarding such contracts the Secretary of the Navy shall give preference to operators who are exclusively engaged in the operation of American flagships.

SEC. 2. (a) Each tanker shall be not less than 25,000 nor more than 32,000 deadweight tons, shall have a speed of not less than 18 knots, and shall be constructed in a shipyard situated within the continental United States for operation under United States registry, such construction to be, so far as practicable, of materials and equipment produced or manufactured in the United States and shall be awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, who can and will construct the said tankers within the period of 2 years as specified in subsection (d) of section 2.

(b) The hire stipulated with respect to any vessel in any charter party entered into under this act shall not exceed an average rate for the life of the charter party of $5 per deadweight ton per month: *Provided*, That such average rate will not result in the recovery of more than two-thirds of the construction cost of the ships.

(c) Any contractor shall agree as part of the contract entered into under the provisions of this act that the vessel or vessels contracted for shall remain under United States registry for 10 years after the period during which such vessel or vessels are under charter to the Navy unless the Secretary of the Navy determines at any time during such 10 years that a transfer of the registry of such vessel or vessels to a foreign country would not be inimical to the national defense, and the Secretary of Commerce likewise determines said transfer to be in the national interest.

(d) Any contract to charter entered into under the provisions of this act shall require that, except for delays not the fault of the owner, including delays excusable under the force majeure clause of the applicable construction contract, the vessel or vessels contracted for shall be tendered to the Navy for service within 2 years after the date of such contract to charter.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the President is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of not to exceed 20 tankers. The tankers shall be of approximately 25,000 deadweight tons each, shall have a speed of not less than 18 knots, and shall be constructed in private shipyards within the continental United States. The construction of the tankers shall be, so far as practicable, of materials and equipment produced or manufactured in the United States.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150 million for the construction of the foregoing vessels."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LECOMPTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 625 he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction of tankers."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RE CRUDE SILICON CARBIDE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8628) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to insure that crude silicon carbide imported into the United States will continue to be exempt from duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this bill was reported favorably by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means and there are no objections on this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1672 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting "crude silicon carbide," after "corundum ore."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8628 is intended to assure that crude silicon carbide shall continue to be exempt from duty when imported into the United States whether it is used as an abrasive or refractory material or in metallurgy.

Silicon carbide is a manmade mineral, produced by fusing sand and coke in an electric furnace. Originally developed over a half century ago as an abrasive material, it has attained preeminence in our industrial economy as the basic material for grinding wheels, abrasive paper and cloth, and so forth, for work on hard and brittle nonferrous metals and ceramics. In war time, silicon carbide becomes even more important because it can be substituted to a considerable extent for industrial diamonds. The supply of diamond bort—produced in Africa—is never adequate in war time, and it must be severely rationed. Silicon carbide has filled the gap. It follows that a large and dependable supply of silicon carbide is necessary not only for our industrial economy but also for national defense.

The Tariff Act of 1930 now provides that "crude artificial abrasives" shall be exempt from duty, and inasmuch as crude silicon carbide has been considered as an artificial abrasive, it has been on the free list. Silicon carbide, made by fusing sand and coke in an electric furnace, has been used chiefly as an abrasive material in the manufacture of grinding wheels, abrasive paper, abrasive cloth, and so forth. In recent years, however, silicon carbide has become increasingly important in a nonabrasive use as a refractory material and in metallurgy.

Because the duty-free status of silicon carbide results from its listing as a crude artificial abrasive, the increasing use of silicon carbide for purposes other than the manufacture of abrasive products raises a doubt as to whether it should still be entitled to classification under Tariff paragraph 1672 and enjoy the resulting duty-free treatment. It is estimated that nonabrasive uses accounted for at least 40 percent of the total quantity of silicon carbide imported and consumed in the years 1952 and 1953.

The United States abrasive, steel, and refractory industries are almost entirely dependent on Canada for their supply of silicon carbide and there is only one

domestic producer of silicon carbide in commercial quantities. Statistics on United States production of crude silicon carbide are not separately reported. However, statistics are reported on production in the United States and Canada combined. These statistics are to be found in the committee report accompanying this legislation, House Report 2209. In recent years imports have supplied about two-thirds of the total United States consumption of crude silicon carbide.

All of Canada's production of silicon carbide is accounted for by 6 branch plants of 5 United States companies. One of these five companies is the only domestic producer. Petroleum-coke and high-grade silica sand which are two major raw materials used in the manufacture of crude silicon carbide are imported duty free from the United States by Canada.

It is my belief that it will be in the interest of our national industrial economy and our national security to assure the continued duty-free entry of silicon carbide.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 208 (5) OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9248) to amend section 308 (5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 308 (5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C. 19: 1308 (5)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(5) Automobiles, motorcycles, bicycles, airplanes, airships, balloons, boats, racing shells, and similar vehicles and craft, and the usual equipment of the foregoing; and in case of all of the foregoing the collectors of customs may, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, defer the exaction of a bond for not to exceed 90 days with respect to such items which are brought temporarily into the United States by nonresidents for the purpose of taking part in races or other specific contests for other than a money purse, but unless such vehicle or craft is exported or the bond is given within the period of such deferment, it shall be subject to forfeiture.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "foregoing;", strike out the balance of line 8 and all of lines 9, 10 and 11, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 to 6 inclusive and insert the following: "all the foregoing which are brought temporarily into the United States by nonresidents for the purpose of taking part in races or other specific contests; and, in the case of vehicles and craft entered under this subdivision to take part in races or other specific contests for other than money purses, collectors of customs, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, may defer the exaction of a bond for not to exceed 90 days after the date of importation, but unless such vehicle or craft is exported or the bond is given within the period of such deferment, such vehicle or craft shall be subject to forfeiture."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9248 will liberalize section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which prescribes conditions under which articles may be imported duty free under bond on a temporary basis. This liberalization will exempt amateur sportsmen who wish to bring their yachts, automobiles, or other craft or vehicles into the United States for participation in races or other contests, when they remain in the country for not more than 90 days, from the requirement that such persons execute a bond to guarantee the exportation of the craft or vehicle.

As presently in force, section 308 (5) permits the entry without payment of duty, under bond for exportation within a period not to exceed 3 years, of vehicles and craft which are brought into the United States by nonresidents for the purpose of taking part in races or specific contests. H. R. 9248 in the case of such vehicles or craft which are brought in by nonresidents to take part in races or specific contests for other than a money purse, would permit the bond requirement to be deferred for 90 days, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may provide.

Provision is made for the forfeiture of such vehicles or craft if not exported within the period of deferment or if appropriate bond is not filed in lieu of exportation within the period of deferment.

The amendment adopted by your committee is clarifying in nature and restores certain restrictive language contained in present law which was inadvertently deleted in the introduced version of H. R. 9248.

H. R. 9248 was reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a reservation of time for this afternoon, but I also have an appointment at the Pentagon. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my time for this afternoon and request permission to address the House for 45 minutes on tomorrow and 45 minutes on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROVIDE FOR TRANSFER OF HAY AND PASTURE SEEDS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 616 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2987) to provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to Federal land-administering agencies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 616 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (S. 2987) to provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to Federal land-administering agencies. House Resolution 616 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

S. 2987 would authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer up to 900,000 pounds of hay and pasture seeds to 3 land-administering agencies of the Federal Government.

Appropriations in the amount of $145,000 to the receiving agencies would be authorized to be applied on costs of transporting and planting of the seeds. An appropriation would also be authorized to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the seeds transferred pursuant to this act. This cost would be approximately $335,600.

The receiving agencies could only use the seeds transferred for the seeding of grazing land administered by them, and it has been estimated that about 110,000 acres of additional rangeland would thus be seeded. The three receiving agencies, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management would, with the cooperation of the range users, be able to do a tremendously important job in building up our range resources.

The ranges of this Nation are subject to deterioration through drought, depletion, noxious range plant invasion, poisonous weed infestation and fire. It appears to me that it is just as vital to take care of our range resources, to maintain and improve and expand them as it is to conserve our forest and mineral resources. This Nation is tremendously wealthy in natural resources and in the conservation of these resources lies the source of our future as a nation. I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill itself will pass.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule or the bill which it makes in order. I do not desire to use any more time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2987) to provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to Federal land-administering agencies.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2987, with Mr. Bow in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill S. 2987 is an identical bill to H. R. 8431 which I introduced in the House in March of this year. The bill is very simple in principle and even very simple in wording. It merely provides to take something that the Government of the United States already owns, namely some seed now deteriorating in warehouses, under the ownership of the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation and place this seed on the rangelands and other lands owned by the United States which themselves are either deteriorating or are not up to maximum use.

In other words, we would take some seed which we have in surplus in warehouses and put it on some land the Government owns, so that the seed itself is used and the land is improved or in some cases actually saved by the prevention of erosion.

Mr. Chairman, it seems hardly necessary for me to take the 5 minutes allowed me by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. The bill actually needs little or no explanation.

The mechanics as provided in the bill for the carrying out of the program are simply these. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to certain agencies surplus hay and pasture seeds acquired under the price-support program. These agencies are the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, which under the bill would receive not to exceed 485,000 pounds; the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior which would be allowed to use 163,000 pounds; the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department, not to exceed 250,000 pounds.

The kinds and quantities of seeds transferred within such maximum quantities, subject to determination of availability and surplus supply by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be determined by such agencies, but shall not exceed quantities which may be utilized for the purposes specified.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Oregon whether the provisions of the bill are broad enough to provide for distribution to the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture for these upstream development projects of which we have launched some 60, or which will be under construction soon. There is considerable reseeding of lands in those river valleys. Would it be broad enough to be made available to the Department of Agriculture for that purpose?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would think that under the wording of the bill the Forest Service would have the right, within its judgment, to place the seeds on any lands under its ownership in the Forest Service.

Mr. BAILEY. In this particular instance the Government would not actually control the land. It is a cooperative undertaking between the Government and local communities, people residing in that particular section of the valley, to build the necessary holding dams to control the flow of water and to reseed for reforestation. It is a general program of rehabilitation of the watersheds. I wondered if it would be available for that purpose.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The program would apply to those lands actually owned by the United States Government. As I read the language of the bill, I would not think there would be any authority in this bill to allow the Forest Service to put seeds on privately owned land. The seed is put on land owned by the Government and administered by either the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Forest Service.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon that I am very much in favor of this bill. At the time it was being considered in committee I attempted to summarize briefly what the bill provides, and these were my words:

> Why not transfer something the Government already has in one agency, which does not need it and will not use it, to three other agencies that do need it and intend to use it? Is that not the heart of it?
>
> Mr. JOY. I think that was intent of the bill.

Then I stated that of course there must be proper accounting, so that there need be no question raised about anything being done contrary to good accounting practice. Is it not the gentleman's understanding that proper accounting will be made and should be made?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his remarks. Yes, I think we need have no slightest doubt regarding the proper accounting of the program that is provided for under this bill, because the seeds are taken from one agency and used and distributed by another. I think it is absolutely mandatory that both agencies account for their action as provided for in the bill. I think we need have no worry about the manner of accounting.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee. I think it is a good bill and ought to be passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, there can certainly be no more valid use for the surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation than the preservation of the natural resources of the United States. I sincerely hope the bill will be adopted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], it would seem to me that if he wants these pilot plant projects eligible to receive any of this seed, he should put in an amendment which, I think, should be satisfactory to the authors of the bill on line 7, page 1, to include the words "Soil Conservation Service" following the words "to the Forest Service" because otherwise I do not think there is any authority in this bill to give the Commodity Credit Corporation the right to turn over to the Soil Conservation Service, which operates the so-called watershed pilot plant protection program, any of this particular seed. I do not see the gentleman from West Virginia on the floor, but may I point out to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] that that would be the answer to the question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support S. 2987, which would provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management for range improvement and conservation programs.

This legislation would serve three purposes. It would improve the carrying capacity of the range on our public lands, and thus provide better feed for our stockmen and sportsmen, and therefore a supply of meat at a reasonable cost to the consuming public.

It would also take out of the Government's hands the seeds which are appropriate for use on the range, and therefore would prevent these seeds from further depressing the market. I am told that the seeds removed from stock by this procedure would include alfalfa, Ladino clover, bromegrass, wheat grass, and tall fescue, to a total of 900,000 pounds.

Finally, this bill would remove these seed stocks from the warehouse where they are deteriorating, a useless burden on the Government's hands, and turn them to a useful purpose.

Therefore, in the interest of the livestock industry, the sportsmen, and the consuming public, in the interest of the seed industry of America, and in the interest of relieving the Government of some of the burden of these surplus seeds, I believe this is good legislation, and should be passed.

I understand that as of April 30, 1954, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 77.4 million pounds of hay and pasture seeds acquired under 1950, 1951, and 1952 price support programs. These seeds, acquired at a cost of $37.3 million after a reserve for losses in the amount of $10.3 million, were carried at a net book value of $27 million. As of that date the records show 24.7 million pounds of hay and pasture seeds had been disposed of at a loss of approximately $5.3 million. The Commodity Credit Corporation discontinued its hay and pasture seed price support operations with the 1952 crops.

Cooperation between the agencies concerned and the users of the land will be required in order to put this program into effect. I think that this is appropriate, in that those who stand to benefit from this program will assist in carrying it out. I understand that for years the grazing land administering agencies and the users have cooperated in range-improvement programs.

Sound soil conservation practices require that our rangelands be maintained and improved. The seed transfers provided in this bill will permit an expansion of our present range improvement programs.

I hope the House will act favorably upon S. 2987.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee have brought us today a piece of constructive and worthwhile legislation that represents the proper approach to the question of reseeding the range. The American people own thousands of acres of rangeland that are chiefly administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The Commodity Credit Corporation also owns thousands of pounds of hay and pasture seed, of which 900,000 pounds is of the type suited for range reseeding. As a prudent landlord our Government is now using the seed to develop its property.

As pointed out in the report the estimated cost of the seeding will be about $6 per acre or an estimated $660,000. The authorized appropriation takes care of but a fraction of this amount. The users of the range will cooperate in carrying out the reseeding program. Again this type of cooperation is the best type of owner-user relationship. The grazing users who cooperate have the benefit of a better range upon which to graze their sheep and cattle and under present administrative procedures they can have the advantage of the increased grazing capacity in their grazing leases.

In the 77th Congress a thorough report on grazing problems was prepared and published under the tile "The Western Range," Senate Document No. 199, and therein the Forest Service estimated that the carrying capacity of the western rangelands as a whole had fallen from an original capacity of 22.5 million animal units to about 10.8 million animal units, or a reduction of more than one-half.

The Forest Service has aggressively pushed a range reseeding program. It is estimated that such a complete program on the national forests alone, would cost $100 million. In recent years the Government has just made a beginning by investing some $3.5 million in reseeding national forest ranges. Another $16.9 million has been spent in range improvement in development of waterholes, drift fences, and other range improvements. At the same time more than $3 million has been privately spent in range improvement and revegetation.

This cooperative approach with the Government assuming its obligation as a landlord in providing the seed for reseeding operations is much to be preferred to the approach suggested by H. R. 6787 and S. 2548 now before the Agriculture Committee. There the permittee is the one who makes the range improvement including the undertaking of range reseeding and elimination of noxious weeds. Then to provide for incentive and encouragement in the range improvement the permittee gains a right to be compensated for any loss suffered when the grazing permit is withdrawn. In effect such an approach gives the permittee an interest in the land itself. An interest that he can require the Government or a subsequent permittee to compensate him for when the permit is withdrawn.

The method of range improvement adopted today is much better and places the responsibility for range reseeding and range improvement squarely upon the shoulders of the Government who is the landlord. Yet those who wish to cooperate, whether they be grazing-permit holders or State fish and game commissions, can do so. And both mutually benefit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the following agencies, free on board transportation conveyance at point of storage, surplus hay and pasture seeds acquired under the price-support program, as follows: To the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, not to exceed 485,000 pounds; to the Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior Department, not to exceed 163,000 pounds; to the Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department, not to exceed 252,000 pounds. The kinds and quantities of seeds transferred within such maximum quantities, subject to determination of availability and surplus supply by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be determined by such agencies, but shall not exceed quantities which may be utilized for the purpose specified in section 2 of this act with funds made available under this act and funds available for such purposes out of appropriations to such agencies for the fiscal year 1954.

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "1954" and insert "1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The seeds transferred pursuant to this act shall be used by the transferee agencies only for the purpose of seeding grazing lands administered by them. To defray costs of transporting and seeding, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the following sums: To the Forest Service, not to exceed $95,000; Fish and Wildlife Service, not to exceed $25,000; and to the Bureau of Land Management, not to exceed $25,000.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the seeds transferred pursuant to this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bow, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2987) to provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to Federal land-administering agencies, pursuant to House Resolution 616, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday night to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. When will the bill be submitted to the full committee?

Mr. TABER. There will be a meeting of the full committee on Friday morning. There is a possibility that the House may not be in session on Friday, and I felt that we should get this permission today.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I announce the unexpected death of Judge Bennett Champ Clark, in Gloucester, Mass., last evening.

Judge Clark first came to this floor as a lad of 3 and was immediately on intimate terms with the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle and

was as faithful in his attendance on the session of the House as any of his father's contemporaries.

His long attendance here, and his presence at every party conference and caucus in which his distinguished father participated, gave him a practical working knowledge of House rules to be secured in no other way. And it was inevitable when his father succeeded to the Speakership, and the great Parliamentarian, Asher Crosby Hinds, was simultaneously elected to membership in the House in the 62d Congress, that Bennett should become his father's Parliamentarian. He retained that position until he resigned to leave with the first American Expeditionary Force for France in the First World War.

When mustered out of the service at the close of the war, he entered the practice of law in St. Louis and became one of the noted trial lawyers of the Missouri bar.

He served 3 terms as United States Senator from Missouri, the first time briefly when appointed to the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Harry B. Hawes, and 2 full terms to which he was elected in 1932 and 1938 respectively.

On his retirement from the Senate in 1945, he was immediately appointed by his friend and former senatorial colleague, President Truman, to the bench of the United States Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia where he was serving at the time of his death.

As Judge Stephens, the presiding judge of the court, well said, in his tribute this morning, "He devoted his life to the service of his country." He was one of the first to volunteer in the First World War, and served successively as captain, lieutenant colonel, and colonel on the General Staff.

He was one of the moving spirits in the organization of the American Legion, was chairman of the Paris caucus and an incorporator and one of the 17 charter members, and served as national commander.

Like his father he was widely considered a presidential possibility and was a colorful figure at recent national conventions. He dies at the prime of life and at the zenith of his career.

He was a distinguished son of a distinguished father—and a beloved son of Missouri.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I wish to join with the gentleman from Missouri in expressing my deep regret at the passing of Bennett Champ Clark. When I came here his very distinguished father was Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was a young man around here, and afterward became Parliamentarian of this House, in which position he distinguished himself.

I never knew a more lovable man than Champ Clark, his father. He had a big, kind, fine heart that went along with a big, fine brain. His son Bennett inherited those fine and noble qualities. As the gentleman said, his life was practically all devoted to public service, in which capacity he distinguished himself. He was a great American.

He was a fine citizen and I deeply regret his passing.

To his lovely wife and his boys I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It was one of the privileges of my life to know the beloved Bennett Champ Clark. His youngsters and mine are exactly the same age. They were frequently at our home and our youngsters were at his home. By reason of that and many other things I came to know Judge Clark very, very well. He certainly was a lovable, fine, great American, whom we shall all miss.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of the late Judge Clark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR JULY 15

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, in order that everyone may be informed, if rules are granted we might call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 8658) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, to provide for punishment of persons who jump bail.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has reported a resolution dealing with the matter of admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Also there is a resolution for the creation of a Special Elections Committee such as is usually provided for as we come to the close of each Congress.

We might also call up the bill (H. R. 236) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan project in Colorado.

There is no definite determination as to when we will call any of these bills, but I announce the possibility of their being called up in order that the Members may have as much notice as possible.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONTROLLED FLIGHT

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 429) authorizing the printing as a House document of the proceedings at Kitty Hawk, N. C., and at Washington, D. C., celebrating the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings conducted at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 15, 16, and 17, 1953, and at Washington, D. C., on December 17, 1953, celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of controlled-powered flight, by Wilbur and Orville Wright shall be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 1, strike out "Kitty" and insert "Kill."
Line 2, strike out "Hawk" and insert "Devil Hills."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Authorizing the printing as a House document of the proceedings at Kill Devil Hills, N. C., and at Washington, D. C., celebrating the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight."

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 87

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 80) to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 87, Review of the United Nations Charter—A Collection of Documents, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document 87, 83d Congress, 2d session, Review of the United Nations Charter—A Collection of Documents.

With the following committee amendments:

Lines 2 and 3, strike out the following: "for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations one" and in lieu thereof insert the word "three."

Line 6, after the word "Documents", insert a semicolon and the following: "1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations and 2,000 copies for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives."

Estimated cost of printing approximately $4,724.07.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was concurred in.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 241) providing for printing as a House document the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document the pledge of allegiance to the flag, as designated in section 7 of the joint resolution approved June 22, 1942 (36 U. S. C., sec. 172), as amended (Public Law 396, 83d Cong., ch. 297, 2d ses.;

H. J. Res. 243, approved June 14, 1954); and that there be printed 681,000 additional copies, of which 437,000 shall be for the use of the House; and 144,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and that there be included thereon the following history of the pledge:

Author of the pledge was Francis Bellamy, born at Mount Morris, N. Y., lived 1855 to 1931. Original pledge first publicly used in 1892, was changed slightly by First and Second National Flag Conferences in 1923 and 1924, was officially designated as Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag by Public Law 287, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945. On June 14, 1954, Flag Day, it was amended by Public Law 396 to include the words "under God."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HATE PROPAGANDA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned, and I think other Members should be deeply concerned, about the fact that while the country is under grave preoccupation with internal security, Communist infiltration, subversion, aggression, and other similar activities, and our people feel very deeply anti-Communist, a group of ultrarightists is seeking to exploit this feeling by sending a very large amount of hate propaganda through the mails which is anti-religious, anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, and anti-Jewish.

I am today introducing a resolution of inquiry to ascertain from the Postmaster General the extent of the hate propaganda, anti-religious, anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, and anti-Jewish, which is going through the mails, not only from domestic sources but from outside the country as well. I have already introduced a resolution to have the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service investigate the situation. My resolution today specifically names the following 10 publications as examples upon which detailed information is requested:

First. Common Sense, allegedly published twice monthly at Union, N. J.

Second. Pamphlet entitled "The Criminals" attributed to Editor Einar Aberg, Norrviken, Sweden, allegedly published in 1950.

Third. A single sheet entitled "Communism" by the same editor as in item 2 carrying pictures, bearing the date "February 1954."

Fourth. A single sheet headed "Stop Invasion," allegedly issued by the Committee To Save the McCarran Act, Tulsa, Okla., or Los Angeles, Calif.

Fifth. A periodical publication Williams Intelligence Summary, allegedly published at Santa Ana, Calif.

Sixth. A single sheet headed "Open Letter to Congress," allegedly published by West Virginia, Anti-Communist League, Huntington, W. Va.

Seventh. The Cross and the Flag, allegedly published monthly at Los Angeles, Calif.

Eighth. A single sheet headed "The Kiss of Death," allegedly issued by the Citizens Protective Association, St. Louis, Mo.

Ninth. A periodical publication called the "Western Voice," allegedly published in Inglewood, Calif.

Tenth. The American Nationalist, allegedly published at Inglewood, Calif.

The deep concern of the country with internal security and Communist infiltration, subversion, and aggression, should not be permitted to divert us so as to afford a cover for hate propaganda distributed or transmitted through the mails. To prevent such exploitation of the deeply anti-Communist feelings of the people by ultrarightists in an equally vital question of internal security.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

RED CHINA'S ADMISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, while the air is filled with pious pretensions of peace, and hyprocrisy parades in the name of diplomacy, aggressive tyranny stalks the free peoples of the world. At the very moment that spokesmen for some of the major powers of the West are championing the cause of Red China's admission to the United Nations, Asia is aflame with new Communist assaults, and the menacing Red tide sweeps on.

Where will it all stop? When can the world hope for respite? What is the answer to this organized violence in our times?

Certainly appeasement is not the answer. We know from bitter experience that appeasement only begets greater demands. The appetites of the tyrant are insatiable. Country after country, people after people have been literally gobbled up by the maws of Soviet imperialism since the end of World War II. These feasts of aggression have only whetted the appetite of the Reds. Asia is next on the Red menu.

How long is it going to take the West to fully comprehend that the key center of all Communist aggression is Moscow? Are we going to be taken in again by the taffy that the way to handle Red aggression is to idly sit by hoping that time will conjure up a rift between the Chinese Reds and Moscow? This is a variation of the devilishly dangerous theme that the Chinese Reds were harmless agrarians and the thing to do was let them alone and they would develop into an Asiatic block against Moscow? Does anyone in his right senses believe this after Korea and Indochina? And where will the blows fall tomorrow?

At the cost of painful disillusionment, we have come to the realization that wishing for peace isn't enough. Peace does not come by wishing for it, and let us once and for all come to the understanding that the absence of shooting does not in itself constitute peace. Where there is a denial of justice for a whole people there is no peace. There can be war without bombs raining from the skies. It is war when the pressures of totalitarian powers are applied to weaker peoples; when the threat of force, actual or implied, is utilized to place outsiders who are not wanted into the ruling places of power in the administration of a sovereign state; when the use of subversion in the form of fifth columns are used to undermine a national regime. This is war that is just as ugly as wholesale killing, for it deprives nations of their independence, condemns whole peoples to enslavement, destroys hope, and reduces men to a state of animality.

So we come to the place, Mr. Speaker, where we must be aware that the Communists are now at war actually with our kind of world. This has to be a premise for a sound, intelligent, and effective foreign policy of the United States. If others, in their materialistic greed, think they can treat safely with the bear, that is their risk and their responsibility. As for ourselves, we have the problem of becoming acquainted with the true nature of the enemy, estimating his capabilities for war, and guiding ourselves accordingly.

No dear cherishing of peace should blind us to the grim realization that this is the century of brutal aggression. Trying to cope with the enemy by traditional sportsmen's rules is like trying to measure the infinite by the finite. Our failures to date in the realm of foreign affairs have been due to our sheer inability to understand communism in action. There were some of us here in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and the record will show it clearly, who warned that the Geneva Conference was nothing but a pitfall for the United States; that no good could possibly come of it; that it was a mistake ever to have assented to the meeting in the first place. And the sorry spectacle of that conference only proves the correctness of our claims. I say this in no vainglorious spirit. There is no pride or sense of accomplishment in saying in these days, "I told you so." No one expects Mr. Dulles to be a superman. He is trying his utmost to achieve peace in our time, and for his attempts, all Americans are appreciative. But, having said this, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we should have learned from experience, we should all know and realize, down to the fourth-grade scholar, that peace as we understand it is not in the Communist lexicon, and that the Reds have only contempt

for us when we allow them to use the forum of a peace conference at Geneva for the furtherance of their aggressive aims. Because of the recognition, homage and prestige which the Reds realized at Geneva, their premier, Chou En-lai, has moved on to a triumphant diplomatic tour, thereby swelling the gains made at Geneva. This was all foreseen, Mr. Speaker. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attest to the fact that some of us called the shots in advance. We can devoutly wish we had been wrong and that some good had come of it all, but Geneva is a diplomatic debacle.

So, too, Mr. Speaker, were the fallacies of the proposed easing of East-West trade restrictions pointed out. Those of us who were against any dropping of the barriers on so-called strategic goods going to countries behind the Iron Curtain made the case that anything which helped to stabilize Soviet control over captive states was a net and substantial gain for Moscow. It is regrettable that London is enkindled with the false hope that the way to deal with the Soviets is to carry hostages to Moscow. Trade purchased at this price will return to haunt the British. It is not without a small measure of satisfaction that I have noted that our own Foreign Operations Administration at long last has made a realistic reappraisal of its own trade policies and has refused to ride on the British trade special to Moscow. Mr. Stassen has read and heeded, for the moment at least, the stop-look-and-listen sign. He might go even further and take a serious look into the offshore procurement program with an eye to strengthening our own economic situation instead of penalizing American business firms that sorely need orders and find themselves faced with the inequitable competition of low-wage foreign companies.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess, having lived through these years of Communist aggression, I must confess to an enveloping sense of unreality that many of us in the Congress, nay all of us, find it necessary at this day and hour, to get up here and confront the necessity of making out a case against Red China as an enemy of the peace. How far have we strayed from reality? What evil influence is at work that such a preposterous proposition as admitting Red China to the United Nations is even a subject for serious debate? Talk about arming a burglar to rob your house. Here is a gang of international brigands who are responsible for the slaughter of thousands of American boys; who are branded as aggressors by the United Nations itself; who at every turn and upon every occasion aid and abet aggression; yet, this is the gang that is proposed for admittance to the very international organization that was avowedly established to perfect collective security and punish the breakers of the peace. Mr. Speaker, one feels a sense of lightheadedness at the very effrontery of the suggestion, and yet we know it is a seriously advanced proposal.

When I was younger and going to school, studying civics and trying to learn history, we were taught that foreign policy was something designed to protect the honor of the Nation and advance its legitimate national interests. Are we to believe in our day, Mr. Speaker, that national honor is a casualty of the times? That this prime consideration has been scrapped? That expediency takes precedence over honor?

I have said before and I say again, and I hope to repeat it over and over, that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. Each and every grave of our honored war dead is a monumental protest against Red China's case for U. N. admission. Just as surely as Munich brought on the ultimate attack on Poland, and the appeasement of Hitler insured World War II, so too would Red China in the United Nations spell doom to freedom and peace in this age, for it would be a signal for new and greater Communist aggression. It would be dismal and conclusive evidence that Western civilization had lost the will to survive before the threat of Communist imperialism. We are fighting to save the freedom; yes to save the lives of our children. Another decade of such monstrous folly, and all will be lost. America has never faced a greater moral or political trial. Upon our actions in this crisis, depends the shape of the world in the future.

MILITARY AND NAVAL CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. ARENDS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9242) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include additional matter.

Mr. RADWAN in two instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. GRANT and to include several poems.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1303. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan; and

S. 3480. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5158. An act for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders; and

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the estates of Opal Perkins, and Kenneth Ross, deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 15, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1734. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 630. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 9757, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 439. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 429. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the proceedings at Kitty Hawk, N. C., and at Washington, D. C., celebrating the 50th anniversary year of controlled-powered flight; with amendment (Rept. No. 2234). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 80. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document 87, Review of the United Nations Charter—A Collection of Documents; with amendment (Rept. No. 2235). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee of conference. House Concurrent Resolution 241. Concurrent resolution providing for printing as a House document the pledge of allegiance to the flag (Rept. No. 2236). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee of conference. H. R. 9242. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2237). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2380. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2381. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain; without amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2864. An act to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit irrigation district, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8006. A bill to safeguard the rights of certain landowners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant; with amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1254. A bill to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 633. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8658, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the punishment of persons who jump bail; without amendment (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 634. Resolution for consideration of House Resolution 627, resolution reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2246). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 233. An act for the relief of Jeno Cseplo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 431. An act for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale; without amendment (Rept. No. 2217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 670. An act for the relief of John Doyle Moclair; without amendment (Rept. No. 2218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 946. An act for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 914. An act for the relief of Mark Vainer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 992. An act for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1158. An act for the relief of Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic); without amendment (Rept. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1321. An act for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko; without amendment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1520. An act for the relief of Andre Styka; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1609. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert Lee Slaughter, nee Elisa Ortiz Orat; without amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1858. An act for the relief of Sister Antonella Marie Gutterres (Thereza Maria Gutterres); without amendment (Rept. No. 2226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1883. An act for the relief of Dr. Takeo Takano; without amendment (Rept. No. 2227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1889. An act for the relief of Margot Goldschmidt; without amendment. (Rept. No. 2228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1902. An act for the relief of Theresa Elizabeth Leventer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2067. An act for the relief of Anthony Benito Estella, Natividad Estella, Antonio Juan Estella, and Virginia Araceli Estella; without amendment (Rept. No. 2230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2222. An act for the relief of Lucia Mezilgoglou; without amendment (Rept. No. 2231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2287. An act for the relief of George Scheer, Magda Scheer, Marie Scheer, Thomas Scheer, and Judith Scheer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3433. An act for the relief of Andreja Glusic; without amendment (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 9901. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9902. A bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the townsite laws applicable in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 9903. A bill to authorize, under regulations of the Civil Service Commission, the withholding, upon request, from compensation of Federal employees amounts for the payment of certain life and hospitalization insurance and credit union savings deposits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 9904. A bill to amend section 9 (c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, relating to elections during economic strikes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 9905. A bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 9909. A bill to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. Res. 631. Resolution to provide expenses for the special committee authorized by House Resolution 439; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 632. Resolution of inquiry to the Postmaster General regarding transmittal of hate propaganda through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 9906. A bill for the relief of Edoardo Maria Filippo Baldassare Perrone di San Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 9907. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 9908. A bill for the relief of Rev. Canon John Malinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1099. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the city council of the city of Chicago at a meeting held June 30, 1954, urging the Congress of the United States to favorably consider the city of Chicago as a site for the erection of a Marine Corps memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

1100. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county clerk, Cook County, Chicago, Ill., relative to being in accord with a petition of the Polish American Congress to extend sympathy and the hand of friendship to the Polish Nation, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.